55575-4-D

New Mexico State
Department of Education

THE NEW MEXICO ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT 1992-93

Alan D. Morgan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

November 1993

NEW MEXICO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Virginia M. Trujillo, President ..... Albuquerque
J. James Sanchez, Vice President ..... Lincoln
Millie Pogna, Secretary ..... Albuquerque
Rudy Castellano ..... Las Vegas
Mariá D. Chávez, Ed.D. ..... Albuquerque
Wallace Davis ..... Shiprock
Charles Dorame ..... Tesuque
M. G. Martinez, Jr. ..... Belen
L. Grady Mayfield, Jr. ..... Las Cruces
Milo L. "Mike" McGonagle ..... Santa Fe
Lynn M. Medlin ..... Tatum
Eleanor Ortiz ..... Santa Fe
Emmalou Rodriguez ..... Albuquerque
Catherine M. Smith ..... Mimbres
Van W. Witt ..... Roswell

Alan D. Morgan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Henry E. Gonzales
Deputy Superintendent

Albert Zamora
Associate Superintendent, Learning Services Division

Michael Davis
Associate Superintendent, School Management Accountability Division

Susan Brown
Assistant Superintendent, School Transportation and Support Services

Tom Trujillo
Assistant Superintendent, Vocational Education Division

Tres Giron
Director, Agency Support Division

The New Mexico State Board of Education and the State Department of Education do not discriminate with regard to race, culture, ancestry, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, or handicap in their programs or hiring practices.

Cover: Scanned photograph of White Sands, NM; photographer Allen Wesson.

Printed November 1993 by the SDE Print Shop.

New Mexico State
Department of Education

THE NEW MEXICO ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT 1992-1993

Prepared by

Allen Wesson
School & Student Data Management

Kathleen Forrer, Ed.D.
School Budget Planning Unit

Louise Cavatta
Patricia Rael
Jim Travelstead
Assessment & Evaluation

Published by

School & Student Data Management
New Mexico State Department of Education
Education Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503
(505) 827-6526

Jerry Cavatta, Ph.D.
State Director

Alan D. Morgan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

November 1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to everyone at the New Mexico State Department of Education whose contributions made this document possible. Special recognition goes to Henry Borgrink and Doris Chávez, School and Student Data Management; the staff of School Budget Planning; Kurt Steinhaus, Educational Planning Services; and Rena Salazar, Interagency Services. Finally, we would like to thank the 88 public school superintendents and their staffs for their timely and courteous responses to our many requests for information.

November 1993

To All New Mexicans:

Once again, the New Mexico State Department of Education is pleased to offer for your examination *The New Mexico Accountability Report*. In its fourth year of publication, the *Report* has been expanded in an effort to provide a more in-depth picture of our public schools. Included is an invitation from the New Mexico State Board of Education for all of us to work together, united under a single vision, to improve education for every child.

This latest report contains a variety of information—descriptions of special interest programs, student trends, achievement and financial data—along with the results of the third Quality of Education Survey. All is presented in the hope that you will take the time to review the contents carefully as a prelude to active and meaningful participation in the process of insuring that the system of education available to the youth of New Mexico is the very best possible. In that light, you are encouraged to visit any school in any district in New Mexico. Talk to the students and the staff. They are the ones who can give you insight into what the numbers truly mean.

Thank you for your continuing interest in the progress of our children. They are without a doubt the most precious resource we have.

Sincerely,

Alan D. Morgan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary vi

Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education 1-3
- "Para educar al niño se necesita todo el pueblo" 1
- Vision 2
- Mission 2
- Goals 2
- *CITE* Policy Framework 3

Overview 4-9
- The New Mexico State Department of Education Vision Statement 4
- Educational Indicators 4-5
- Ranking 5-6
- History of the New Mexico Accountability Report 6
- Standards for Excellence 6-7
- New Mexico Third Annual Progress Report on Education 7-8
- Quality of Education Survey 8

Of Special Interest in New Mexico Schools 10-14
- Continuation Projects 10
- New Projects 11
- Innovative District/School-Based Programs 11-12
- Other Special Projects 12-13

Student Indicators 15-21
- Student Enrollment Trends 15
- Student Ethnicity 15-16
- Percent of Graduating Seniors and College Applicants With District Rankings 16
- Dropout Rates and District Rankings 17

Student Achievement Indicators 22-44
- Introduction 22
- New Mexico Portfolio Writing Assessment--Grades 4 and 6 22
- New Mexico Achievement Assessment (ITBS)--Grades 3, 5, and 8 23
- College Entrance Examination (ACT) Results 23
- The New Mexico High School Competency Examination 23-24
- Reading Assessment--Grades 1 and 2 24

Financial Indicators 45-60
- State General Fund Appropriations 45
- Average Teacher Salaries 46
- Percent of Net Operating Budget Spent for Salaries 46-47
- Total Expenditures per Student and District Rankings 47
- Administrative Expenditures per Student and District Rankings 48
- Percent of Budget for Selected Programs 48
- Percent of Students Served by Selected Programs 48
- State Special Education Revenue 48

Bibliography 61

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table

1. Quality of Education Survey Results 9
2. District Reported New Mexico Scholars - 1993 14
3. Dropouts By Ethnicity and Gender: Grades 9-12 17
4. New Mexico Dropout Rates: Grades 9-12 18-19
5. New Mexico Graduation Statistics: 1990-91 to 1992-93 20-21
6. Writing Assessment—Grade 4: Number and Percent of Students at Each Holistic Score 28-32
7. Writing Assessment—Grade 6: Number and Percent of Students at Each Holistic Score 33-37
8. ITBS/J Basic Composite Scores: Grades 3, 5, and 8 38-39
9. ACT Composite Scores and District Rankings 40
10. 1992-93 ITBS/J and 1991-92 ACT Rankings by School Cluster 41-42
11. High School Competency Examination: Percent of Grade 10 Students Passing All Subtests 43-44
12. Average Returning Teacher Salaries Without Increments From Tentative Budgets for School Years 1990-91 to 1992-93 48-49
13. Percent of 1992-93 Net Operating Budget Spent for Salaries 50
14. Net and Total Operational Expenditures per Student With District Rankings for 1990-91 to 1992-93 ... 51-52
15. Administrative Costs per Student With District Rankings for 1990-91 to 1992-93 53-54
16. Selected Federal Programs as a Percentage of 1992-93 District Total Operational, Federal Project, and USDA Free and Reduced Lunch Program Funding 55-56
17. 1992-93 Percent of Enrollment Served by Selected Programs / 1992-93 Percent of All Lunches Served Represented by Free and Reduced Lunches 57-58
18. 1992-93 Special Education Revenue Allotted Through the State Funding Formula 59

Figure

1. Student Enrollment Trends: 1990-91 to 1992-93 15
2. Student Enrollment by Ethnicity: 1992-93 16
3. New Mexico Portfolio Writing Assessment: 1992-93 Statewide Summary for Grades 4 and 6 25
4. New Mexico ITBS/J Percentile Score by Content Area: Grade 3 25
5. New Mexico ITBS/J Percentile Score by Content Area: Grade 5 26
6. New Mexico ITBS/J Percentile Score by Content Area: Grade 8 26
7. High School Competency Examination: Percent of 10th Grade Students Passing All Six Subtests Attempted 27
8. High School Competency Examination: Performance by Subtests (Grade 10: Percent Passing on First Attempt) 27
9. New Mexico General Fund Appropriations (In Millions) 45
10. The Public School and the Total Appropriation: A Comparison from 1990-91 To 1992-93 (In Millions) 46
11. Average Teacher Salaries: 1990-91 to 1992-93 47

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Each year, the New Mexico State Department of Education and each of the 88 local public school districts in New Mexico publish "report cards" that provide information on the operation and performance of our schools and our students. These "report cards" are required under New Mexico law (Section 22-1-6, NMSA) and are intended to inform parents, citizens and public officials as to the status and progress of public education in our communities and our State.

The New Mexico Accountability Report is the state level "report card" published each year by the New Mexico State Department of Education. This report provides narrative and statistical information on an array of educational indicators—items of information on the strength and performance of public education in New Mexico. These indicators include enrollment trends, funding and expenditure levels, graduation and college bound statistics, specialized program support and participation levels, as well as student performance and achievement information. These data are presented for each of our 88 public school districts, and where possible, three years of information are provided.

Public education in New Mexico continues to grow, improve, and meet the changing needs of our students and communities. Over the past three years, our student enrollment has grown from 301,885 students during the 1990-91 school year to 315,278 students in 1992-93, an increase of 4.3 percent. Special Education led enrollment growth with a 1990-91 to 1992-93 expansion of 11.5 percent, followed by secondary education (grades 7-12) and elementary education (grades K-6) growing at rates of 5.2 percent and 2.7 percent respectively. The past three years have also seen a continued shift in the ethnic makeup of our student population, with increases in the percent of Hispanic and Native American students and decreases in our Anglo population. For the 1992-93 school year our student population was 40.8 percent Anglo, 45.8 percent Hispanic, 10.2 percent Native American, 2.3 percent African American, and 0.9 percent Asian.

The last three years also saw improvements in our students' performance and in our abilities to measure that performance. During the 1990-91 school year, 74 .9 percent of our tenth grade students passed all parts of the New Mexico High School Competency Exam on their first attempt. By 1991-92, that percentage had increased to 76.0 percent and in 1992-93 the percentage increased to 84.1 percent. In 1991-92, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills was used for the first time to measure the academic performance of third, fifth, and eighth grade students. Many of our school districts scored well above national averages. In most areas our statewide student performance was slightly below national averages.

Over the past three years, the amount of the appropriation from the State General Fund to the public schools has increased; however, the percent of the appropriation has decreased from 48.25 percent in 1990-91 to 47.30 percent in 1992-93. Additionally, New Mexico teachers did not keep pace with regional educators in terms of average teachers' salaries. From 1990-91 to 1992-93, New Mexico average returning teachers' salaries increased from $25,753 to $26,451, an increase of 2.71 percent. Salaries for the region in the same timeframe increased from $27,781 to $29,312, an increase of 5.51 percent.

CONSOLIDATING INITIATIVES FOR TOMORROW'S EDUCATION

"Para educar al niño se necesita todo el pueblo."

In September 1992, the New Mexico State Board of Education established *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education (CITE)—A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico.* In its opening challenge, the Board emphasizes that "*CITE* [both] empowers the local community and the citizens of New Mexico to join with the State Board in finding new and better ways for students to reach their potential . . . [and] affirms the leadership and developmental role of the State Board . . . ." (*CITE*, p. 2.)

Recognizing that improvements to New Mexico's public schools have already taken place, the Board affirms that even greater strides can be made through the medium of a single, focused vision:

> The power of *CITE* lies in sharing a common vision of desired end results. Although *CITE* represents the consensus of many educational stakeholders, it is not intended to be the final word in bringing improvements to the educational system. Lasting improvements will require ownership by New Mexicans, and obtaining such ownership requires involvement. Therefore, in September 1992, the State Board initiated a comprehensive and inclusive process to involve New Mexicans in helping to identify educational initiatives to achieve the *CITE* goals. In addition, the State Board and the State Department of Education collaborated with other stakeholders in using the *CITE* Policy Framework to develop action plans, which define the activities, outcomes, and measurement criteria necessary to implement the *CITE* goals and initiatives. These efforts chart a road map for education upon which there is broad consensus among New Mexicans. Parents and families, legislators, business people, and the education professionals of our state can and will work together to meet the educational demands of our complex modern world.
>
> *CITE* is uniquely a New Mexico effort that builds upon our strengths as a state while guiding our paths to the future—what we must do so that all students are challenged to reach their potential and the education of all students becomes the mission for all New Mexicans. (*CITE*, p. 3.)

To underscore the importance of education in all of our lives, the Board has issued a challenge to the citizens of New Mexico to join in an exciting enterprise—the journey to achieve the *CITE* vision, mission, and goals.

The following sections detail the Board's vision, mission, and goals as well as the specific components of the *CITE* policy framework. To explore the *CITE* concept further, the interested reader may obtain a copy of *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education (CITE)—A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico* from the Educational Planning Services Unit, New Mexico State Department of Education, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503.

Vision

The State Board of Education, by authority of the New Mexico State Constitution, sets policy and direction for the education of all students in New Mexico. We believe that education must challenge all students to reach their potential and must involve all citizens of the state. (*CITE*, p. 4.)

Mission

The State Board of Education, through its Constitutional duties and responsibilities, affirms that the primary purpose of schools in New Mexico is to provide equal educational opportunities for all students. The purpose of schools, therefore, is to guarantee that students reach their full potential by mastering learning skills and knowledge and by acquiring desirable personal qualities and values.

The State Board of Education believes that local control and direction will best accomplish the shared responsibility and leadership necessary for the effective and efficient use of public and private resources and for the continuing involvement of parents and communities in the educational process.

This mission will be carried out by the policy leadership of the State Board of Education through the State Department of Education. (*CITE*, p. 5.)

Goals

The State Board of Education considers a student to be an individual who is involved in lifelong learning by participating in preschool through adult educational and vocational rehabilitation opportunities and services. The goals are listed in sequential order to demonstrate and help clarify the linkages between goals.

Two important processes began in September 1992. First, the State Board of Education initiated a series of community meetings to involve New Mexicans in helping to identify educational initiatives to achieve the *CITE* goals. And second, the State Department of Education used the *CITE* Policy Framework to develop an Agency Management Plan, which defines activities, outcomes, and measurement criteria necessary to implement the *CITE* goals and initiatives.

Goal 1: Involve all New Mexicans in a shared responsibility for education

Goal 2: Provide opportunities which will enable all students to learn

Goal 3: Establish high standards and high expectations to enable students to acquire the personal qualities, values, skills, and knowledge necessary to become productive citizens in a multiethnic democratic society

Goal 4: Seek and reward excellence in teachers and other school personnel

Goal 5: Advocate for and seek adequate resources to support maximum student learning

Goal 6: Organize resources for system-wide change to prepare students for the future

Goal 7: Promote, exemplify, and implement decision making at the appropriate level

Goal 8: Assure to the public the integrity of the educational process through program and financial accountability

(*CITE*, pp. 6-7.)

CITE Policy Framework

Below is a graphic display of CITE – A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico. Beginning from the center, the concentric circles represent increasing degrees of detail describing the focus on striving to reach the vision. Imagine that each of the individual rings can rotate. For example, many educational initiatives are designed to help achieve more than one goal. The outer ring begins to identify those in the education community who will be part of planning, implementing, and assessing initiatives – a continuous process of improvement.


Partners in Planning, Implementing, and Assessing
Students and teachers
Governor
Initiatives
Community planners
Business
Goals
Special projects
Commissions and task forces
1. Involve all New Mexicans in a shared responsibility for education
2. Provide opportunities which will enable all students to learn
8. Assure to the public the integrity of the educational process through program and financial accountability
Tribal governments
Parents and families
Mission
3. Establish high standards and high expectations to enable students to acquire the personal qualities, values, skills, and knowledge necessary to become productive citizens in a multi-ethnic democratic society
Advocacy groups and other stakeholders
Effective and efficient use of resources
Desirable personal qualities and values
Vision
Challenge all students to reach their potential
7. Promote, exemplify, and implement decision making at the appropriate level
Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches of state and federal government
Public and private schools
Master learning skills and knowledge
Equal educational opportunity
6. Organize resources for system-wide change to prepare students for the future
4. Seek and reward excellence in teachers and other school personnel
Higher education
Other state and federal agencies
5. Advocate for and seek adequate resources to support maximum student learning
State Department of Education and Vocational Rehabilitation
Local government
Local boards of education
State Board of Education

OVERVIEW

The New Mexico State Department of Education VISION STATEMENT

The New Mexico State Department of Education believes the education of *all* students must become the mission for *all* New Mexicans. We believe education must challenge *all* students to reach their potential.

Alan D. Morgan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Educational Indicators

Educator Jeannie Oakes has defined an educational indicator as "a statistic about the educational system that reveals something about its performance or health." The identification of appropriate indicators of the status or "health" of an educational system is a relatively new endeavor. A recent RAND study suggested that indicators cover three broad classes: **inputs**, which include such data as fiscal, material, and other resources, teacher qualifications, and student background; **processes**, such as school context and organization indicators, curriculum, teaching quality, and instructional quality; and **outputs**, such as student achievement, participation, attitudes, and aspirations (Shavelson et al., 1989).

Legislation was passed in April 1990 that identified certain educational indicators for New Mexico schools and required both individual school districts and the State Department of Education to report on these indicators. The educational indicators required by the legislation are:

- Enrollment Statistics
- Advanced Placement Enrollment Statistics
- Total Expenditures per Pupil (3 years)
- Total Administrative Expenditures per Pupil (3 years)
- Average Teacher Salary (3 years)
- State Mandated and College Entrance Test Scores (3 years)
- Participation in the New Mexico Scholars Program
- Percentage of Graduating Class Applying to Colleges
- Dropout Rate (3 years)
- Percentage of 12th grade seniors who graduate (3 years)
- Percentage of 9th grade freshmen plus transfers (9-12) who graduate
- Percentage of Students in Federally Funded Programs
- Percentage of School Budget Expended on Federal Programs

The legislation also requires districts to be ranked statewide on those indicators requiring a three year report, and state and national means or medians are given for comparative purposes when appropriate. For all items except the norm referenced state mandated and college entrance examinations, a simple ranking is used.

Legislation passed in 1991 appended a Quality of Education Survey to be sent home with students to survey parental attitudes toward their child's education.

Ranking

A simple statistical ranking is similar to the ranking of your favorite sports team during the season. Schools, therefore, like baseball teams, may find themselves tied for, say, first place or third place with another school. If a school ties with another school, both schools will receive the same rank. For instance, if four schools have the following scores respectively—30, 25, 25, 19—then the four schools would be ranked, respectively—1, 2, 2, and 4. Note there is no "third place" ranking, because school number 2 and school number 3 had the same score.

However, the reader should approach the interpretation of these rankings with caution, especially when looking at percentages in small districts. For instance, the Dora district began the 1992-93 school year with seven seniors, six of whom graduated, giving Dora a "graduation rate" of 85.7 and a ranking of 77 out of the 88 districts, but the Cloudcroft district began the year with 32 seniors, of whom 31 graduated. Because of the larger numbers, Cloudcroft had a "graduation rate" of 96.9 and a ranking of 31 out of the 88 districts. Similarly, House graduated 5 out of 5 seniors beginning the school year, thus tying for first out of 88 districts.

For the norm referenced (standardized) examinations (ITBS and ACT), the districts' simple rankings are presented within clusters, or groupings, of similar school districts. Districts are then ranked within their respective cluster. Based on national research, the districts were clustered or grouped about five variables by the State Department of Education: *district enrollment size, district student mobility rate, district percentage of students in the USDA Free and Reduced Lunch Program, district percentage of students classified as Limited English Proficiency (LEP), and the district percentage of adults 25 years of age or older who graduated college.* Six clusters of similar districts were identified using the Ward's Minimum Variance procedure (SAS, 1985):

Albuquerque	Animas	Bernalillo	Dexter	Chama	Alamogordo
Artesia	Capitan	Central	Estancia	Cuba	Aztec
Belen	Carrizozo	Cobre	Floyd	Dulce	Carlsbad
Bloomfield	Cimarron	Deming	Fort Sumner	Hatch	Clovis
Gadsden	Clayton	Espanola	Hagerman	Hondo Valley	Farmington
Las Cruces	Cloudcroft	Gallup-McKinley	Jal	Jemez Mountain	Hobbs
Las Vegas City	Corona	Grants-Cibola	Lake Arthur	Jemez Valley	Moriarty
Los Alamos	Des Moines	Lordsburg	Loving	Las Vegas West	Roswell
Los Lunas	Dora	Magdalena	Maxwell	Mesa Vista	Ruidoso
Lovington	Elida	Questa	Tatum	Mora	Truth or
Pojoaque	Eunice	Santa Rosa	Texico	Mosquero	Consequences
Portales	Grady	Tularosa		Mountainair	
Santa Fe	House	Vaughn		Pecos	
Silver City	Logan			Penasco	
Socorro	Melrose			Raton	
Taos	Quemado			Springer	
Tucumcari	Reserve			Wagon Mound	
	Roy			Zuni	
	San Jon				

While cluster analysis is used in this report only to report the norm referenced (standardized) tests, the reader will want to bear in mind these similar districts when looking at other indicators, such as graduation rate.

Finally, it is more important to compare changes in the actual test score rather than the ranking. A district may be ranked low, yet still fall within the acceptable range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean (average).

History of the New Mexico Accountability Report

All public education is accountable to its public and elected officials; however, public report cards for each district did not become a matter of policy until October 1985 when the State Board of Education approved for public review the Building Excellent Schools Team (BEST) Plan. The BEST Plan included over 30 goals for the improvement of pupil learning, teacher and instructional quality, school administrators and the school community, and state leadership.

In 1987, the *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education (CITE) Plan* continued many of the initiatives found in the BEST Plan but now became the working document for reporting State Board of Education goals and progress toward those goals. The first adopted *CITE* Plan was developed for 1987-1990; the 1990 edition included goals for 1990-1993. In September 1992, a new evolution of *CITE* was adopted by the State Board. Called *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education: A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico,* the current document is intended to support a "comprehensive and inclusive process" that will involve all New Mexicans in building concensus on the best approaches to educating the children of this state.

Senate Bill 738 (Section 22-1-6, NMSA) was passed on April 6, 1989, and required school districts to publish an Annual School District Accountability Report in a local newspaper. SB-738 required districts to publish Mission and Goals, Student Information, a section Of Special Interest, Financial Information, and an Invitation for the public to participate in the educational process. Finally, districts were required to "compare district, state, and national data whenever appropriate . . . ."

House Bill 4, passed during the 1990 Special Legislative Session, superceded SB-738, requiring districts to report additional information and providing for a statewide accountability report to be published by the State Department of Education based on the educational indicators listed on page 1.

House Bill 721 passed the 1991 Legislative Session. This bill appends a parental survey to the *Accountability Report* and the districts' report cards. Ten questions developed by the NMSBE are aggregated in this report. Each district is required additionally to report 10 survey questions, no more than five of which are developed by the local school board and five of which are developed by local school teachers and administrators. Local results will be published in the districts' own report cards.

Standards for Excellence

On November 26, 1991, the State Board of Education adopted the "Standards for Excellence for New Mexico Schools" with the provision that districts could choose to follow either the new standards or the "Educational Standards for New Mexico" in pursuing accreditation. The Standards for Excellence were the product of a statewide committee appointed by the State Board and charged to develop a document of ten pages or less that "should address specifically how schools should be accountable for defining, addressing, and evaluating outcomes for all students." In support thereof, student competencies as well as assessment procedures had to be revised. The social studies competencies were the first to be completed and adopted by the Board.

During the 1991-92 school year—and using the social studies framework as their model—statewide work groups analyzed and revised the student competencies in the areas of employability, health, interscholastic activities, language arts, mathematics, modern and classical languages, music, physical education, science, and visual arts. Following that work and an extensive review, the frameworks were adopted by the State Board of Education during its August 1992 meeting.

The frameworks are intended to provide the structure, or skeleton, upon which local curricula are built. Each curriculum framework enables districts/schools to evaluate their current program, determine what is successful, and identify and address gaps in the program. The framework serves as a guide to assist educators in planning and coordinating what will be taught within a K-12 program. Ultimately, these frameworks will lead students toward the achievement of the Standards for Excellence.

New Mexico Third Annual Progress Report on Education

In 1991, Governor Bruce King issued *The New Mexico Progress Report on Education* detailing the state's efforts toward achieving the six national educational goals established by President George Bush and the state governors at the 1989 Education Summit. This September, the *New Mexico Third Annual Progress Report on Education* was released.

Once again, Governor King has initiated a variety of activities designed to help the state achieve its educational objectives in pursuit of the national goals:

- The Governor's Office and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction have jointly created New Mexico Systemic Change in Education Advisory Committee to serve as an advocate and Facilitator for systemic change in New Mexico.
- High school students from throughout New Mexico participated in the Governor's Youth Education Summit in April 1993.
- The Governor's Business Executives for Education are continuing their efforts to provide support to schools in initiating total quality management principles in education based on community-identified needs.
- The New Mexico Communities in Schools Project (NMCIS), now operating out of the Children, Youth and Families Department, designs and implements more effective school-human services collaborative efforts to improve the success of at-risk students and their families.
- The Children, Youth and Families Department is implementing new service delivery strategies which will enhance the lives of children in all areas.
- The Governor's Office, the State Department of Education, and the Department of Health have sponsored two regional conferences for 16 New Mexico communities.
- The New Mexico communities in Schools Project (NMCIS) continues to function in four communities, with an additional four communities in the planning stage.
- Focus on improving math and science education in New Mexico schools through the Systemic Initiative in Math and Science Education continues.
- The Committee Advocating Resources and Enrichment (CARE) for Children continues to develop plans and recommendations focused on the pre-school years, so that children can start ready for school success.
- The Governor's Substance Abuse Prevention Task Force focus state efforts to make schools and their communities drug-free.

(*Progress Report*, p. 1-2)

Five complementary initiatives begun by the State Department of Education are also cited:

- The State Board of Education continues to expect all New Mexico graduating seniors to be competent in two languages by the year 2000. . . .

- Among the states New Mexico has been a leader in the school restructuring movement. Within that framework, the RE:LEARNING Program has been a primary vehicle for change. The restructuring concept is based on the belief that systemic school reform is needed in order for all students to be able to use their minds well, and to be decision-makers, team members, good communicators and knowledgeable about important matters. Over fifty local schools within New Mexico are currently participating . . . . Seventeen additional schools are involved in the RE:Learning process with support from the Noyes Foundation.

- A commission appointed by the State Board of Education developed Standards for Excellence, which have been adopted as a state board regulation. Implementation is beginning. These standards define the expected outcomes for all students in New Mexico in those schools operating at a level of excellence. . . . [and] now form a basis for school accountability based primarily on elements which support student learning. The goal now is that schools be accreditated by the Standards of Excellence and accompanying components.

- As part of statewide long-range planning and policy development, the State Boared of Education is conducting community meetings to identify actions to improve the future of education in New Mexico.

(*Progress Report*, pp. 3-4)

Quality of Education Survey

Senate Bill 721, passed by the 1991 New Mexico Legislature, appended a Quality of Education Survey to the *Accountability Report*. The Quality of Education Survey was not designed as a scientific survey based on probability but rather as a site-level census. This means the Quality of Education Survey results are most valid at the site (school) level and are a reflection only of those parents choosing to respond (28.8%). In addition, some parents with more than one child returned only a single survey form with multiple responses per question. Finally, because standard sampling techniques were not emphasized, generalizations based on data aggregated statewide should be approached with caution. With that in mind, in all cases the percentage of respondents agreeing with the statement exceeded the percentage disagreeing. For items 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, over 80 percent were in agreement, while for items 1, 5 and 10 over 70 percent were. The highest negative response was to item 9 with which 30.5 percent disagreed; however, 56.6 percent were still in agreement. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1

QUALITY OF EDUCATION SURVEY RESULTS

1992-93

Total number of surveys sent home with students: 294,789
Total number of surveys returned: 84,852 (28.8%)
Total number of districts reporting: 87

	PERCENT RESPONDING				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. The schools build my child's self-esteem.	18.2%	61.5%	10.8%	3.6%	5.8%
2. The school personnel in this community are well-qualified for their jobs.	19.5%	60.6%	7.9%	2.5%	9.4%
3. Teachers set expectations which challenge my child.	21.1%	60.7%	10.0%	2.8%	5.3%
4. The school offers classes that meet my child's needs.	20.3%	62.4%	10.2%	3.3%	3.8%
5. The schools in this community should be required to use standard national tests to measure the academic achievement of students.	22.6%	50.0%	11.8%	5.5%	10.2%
6. School personnel encourage me to participate in my child's education.	24.2%	56.7%	12.1%	3.9%	3.1%
7. My child's teacher provides sufficient and appropriate information regarding my child's academic progress.	30.0%	54.0%	9.7%	3.4%	2.9%
8. The school put adequate resources into extracurricular activities.	12.1%	49.2%	17.3%	7.7%	13.7%
9. My child has adequate supplies.	10.4%	46.2%	20.0%	10.4%	13.0%
10. My child's school building is in good repair.	16.1%	55.8%	12.0%	6.0%	10.1%

OF SPECIAL INTEREST IN NEW MEXICO SCHOOLS

The 1993 Legislature appropriated a total of $3,277,500 for Special Projects to the State Department of Education. Categorical in nature, the following projects were funded outside of the formula used to determine operational program costs.

CONTINUATION PROJECTS:

1. **ANGELITAS PROGRAM:** The program provides career and college planning information, counseling services, financial aid planning, preparation for test-taking, skill-development sessions, and summer college placement opportunities. Target population: Minority high school students. Participating schools: Gadsden, Onate, Las Cruces, Mayfield, and Hatch High Schools.

2. **CAREER INFORMATION SYSTEM:** The program provides educational/career information to secondary schools for use in counseling students through the Guidance Information System Computer Network. The program is administered by the New Mexico State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. Target population: High school students. Participating schools: 75 high schools statewide.

3. **INDIAN EDUCATION FOR EXCELLENCE:** The purpose of the program is to develop model programs, conduct research, and provide technical assistance to school districts and tribal governments relative to the educational issues of Native American students in New Mexico. Target population: Native American students. Participating schools: 22 public school districts serving Native American students.

4. **LAW RELATED EDUCATION:** The purpose of the program is to promote innovative citizenship education through the development and dissemination of educational materials, training teachers in law-related educational techniques, and the annual mock trial competition. The project is administered by the New Mexico Bar Foundation. Target population: 350 teachers and administrators of mid high and high schools and students in grades K-12. Participating schools: 70 school districts.

5. **LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT (LEAD):** The purpose of the program is to assist in the promotion and development of leadership skills for school administrators. The project is based at the University of New Mexico. Target population: Administrators in New Mexico schools.

6. **SYSTEMIC INITIATIVE IN MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION (SIMSE):** The purpose of the program is to restructure and improve New Mexico's mathematics and science education system by providing statewide training for K-8 math and science teachers. The project is administered by the University of New Mexico. Target population: Students in grades K-8. Participating schools: 34 school districts.

7. **RE:LEARNING NEW MEXICO:** The program supports restructuring of the educational system from kindergarten to post-secondary levels in New Mexico schools. The effort is based on Ted Sizer's Nine Common Principles; the focus is helping students to use their minds well. The project is administered by Eastern New Mexico University. Participating schools: 50 Re:Learning schools statewide.

8. **SCHOOL ARTS INITIATIVE :** The purpose of the program is to develop a comprehensive multicultural sequential arts education curriculum in the visual arts, music, dance, and drama and for planning and developing pilot programs in preparation for implementation of this curriculum in selected school districts over a three-year period. Target population: K-5 students. Target population: K-12 students. Participating districts: Albuquerque, Carlsbad, Las Cruces, and Ruidoso.

NEW PROJECTS:

CHARTER SCHOOLS: The following ten schools were given $5,000 planning grant awards by the State Board of Education. In the spring of 1994, five (but not limited to the ten schools listed below) will be selected as charter schools.

Albuquerque Public Schools/Longfellow Elementary
Bernalillo Public Schools/Carroll Elementary
Las Cruces Public Schools/Hermosa Heights Elementary
Roswell Independent Schools/Washington Avenue Elementary
Santa Fe Public Schools/Turquoise Trail Elementary
Taos Public Schools/Taos Elementary School
Albuquerque Public Schools/Taylor Middle School
Gallup-McKinley County Public Schools/John F. Kennedy Middle School
Ruidoso Municipal Schools/White Mountain Intermediate School
Albuquerque Public Schools/Highland High School

INNOVATIVE DISTRICT/SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS:

1. **STARSHINE: ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS/Bandelier Elementary, Whittier Elementary, Wilson Middle and Van Buren Middle.** An innovative project (Bandelier Performing Arts Project) allows students of diverse backgrounds to explore, gather, and synthesize information in content areas in collaborative groups and then demonstrate this knowledge through music and the performing arts. The project is especially innovative since it is totally outcome based (supports Standards For Excellence Literacy and Attitudes and Attributes goals) and utilizes alternative assessment procedures. Target Population: K-9 grade regular and special education students.

2. **SEVENTH GRADE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT PROJECT: ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS/John Adams Middle.** A project which will use portfolio assessment to measure student achievement and determine student mastery of the New Mexico Competency Frameworks at the seventh grade. A committee of teachers, parents, students, administrators, and community members will develop standards for what students should know and be able to do. Students will complete a portfolio that will include each subject areas: math, science, language arts, social studies, and bilingual education. Target Population: 6-8 grade students.

3. **TEACHING WITH STYLE AND INTELLIGENCE: BELEN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS/H.T. Jaramillo Elementary.** The focus is to define students by their strengths and to increase each student's opportunity to develop traits such as: creativity and problem solving that would help them become resilient. The goals of this project are to build a common understanding of training and experience to all faculty on learning styles and multiple intelligences; and to pilot and incorporate two projects through after-school clubs for students in grades 1-3. Target Population: 1-3 grade students.

4. **TWO-YEAR PILOT PROJECT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NONGRADED ELEMENTARY PROGRAM: BERNALILLO PUBLIC SCHOOLS/ Cochiti Elementary.** Cochiti elementary will begin implementation of a nongraded program for students seven to eleven years old (2nd grade - 5th grade). Cochiti will have an intermediate unit consisting of three classrooms with students ages seven through nine and an advanced unit with students ages nine through eleven. The division of students will allow for multi-aged grouping and placing students with teachers that match their learning style. Target Population: 2-5 grade students with expansion to kindergarten.

5. **INTERDISCIPLINARY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION: CORONA MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS/ Corona High School.** The project intent is to fund teachers and consultants to develop a comprehensive curriculum integrating all disciplines through the arts utilizing resources from the local community and focusing on outcomes based education for seventh and eighth grade students. Utilizing a community-based effort, the concept will link Corona's students with several educational sites outside New Mexico through the use of interactive technology. Target Population: 7-8 grade students.

6. **TEAM TEACHING WITH MULTI-AGED GROUPING: FLOYD MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS/Floyd Elementary.** The project will design and implement a multi-aged classroom with a team teaching approach. The program will be designed to help children meet basic and challenging performance standards while learning "how to learn". Multi-aged grouping allows for children's differences in learning styles, developmental levels and timelines for mastery of learning. This program will be used as a professional development site by Eastern New Mexico University's student teachers and a pilot practicum program for a methods class sponsored by the university. Target Population: 1-2 grade students.

7. **OPERATION HOME LIBRARY: MOUNTAINAIR PUBLIC SCHOOLS/Mountainair Elementary School.** The purpose of this project is to foster literacy within the elementary school population. The program will assist Mountainair Elementary students who are "at-risk" and will also motivate parents, teachers and children to develop a love for reading. The project will help children overcome comprehension and communication stumbling blocks and become "life-long" learners and stimulate parents to become more involved in adult basic literacy programs. Target Population: K-6 grade students.

8. **"A-LAB-IN-A-BOX": SILVER CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS/Cliff Elementary, Harrison Schmitt Elementary, Jose Barrios Elementary, G.W. Stout Elementary, Sixth Street Elementary.** The goal of this project is to facilitate access to and use of materials by elementary teachers and be used to enhance each unit of study in the Science areas covered at that grade level. In addition, each kit and unit will be integrated across other content areas. Target Population: K-5 grade students.

9. **NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES: TAOS MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS/Taos High School.** This project developed jointly with the Taos Pueblo Governor's Office will implement a comprehensive Native American Studies course and research center to study the Tiwa language, Taos custom and history, traditional government, art and culture resulting in the development of positive intercultural relations and pride and reduce dropouts among Native American students. Teaching will be accomplished utilizing a native Tiwa speaker from the Pueblo. Target Population: 12 grade students.

10. **A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO CULTURAL EDUCATION IN ZUNI: ZUNI PUBLIC SCHOOLS/ Zuni Middle School, Zuni High School, Twin Buttes High School.** A collaboration between the Zuni Public School District, the A:Shiwi A:Wam Museum and Heritage Center, and elders from the Zuni Senior Center to reorganize a collection of 3,000 historic photographs into student research categories. Students are introduced to Zuni cultural and historical issues through the mentorship of community elders in the course of accomplishing a meaningful task on behalf of the museum. This project addresses concerns raised by community members about the lack of culturally-relevant curriculum material. Target Population: 6-12 grade students.

OTHER SPECIAL PROJECTS

1. **HISPANIC CULTURE FOUNDATION:** The program provides teams of educators from restructuring elementary, middle, and secondary schools with culturally-relevant arts and humanities content, technical assistance in multicultural, interdisciplinary curriculum development and methodology. Its goal is to empower teachers to "teach New Mexico" while developing models that can be adopted by individual schools and districts throughout the state and nation. Target population: K-12 students. Participating schools: 11 schools statewide.

2. **SOUTHWEST AIDS COMMITTEE:** The program will provide HIV / AIDS prevention education to students, parents, and public school faculty and staff. Target population: K-12 students. Participating schools: Statewide public schools.

3. **DOWNS MEDIA EDUCATION CENTER:** The project will integrate media literacy into existing programs and curricula with a focus on training teachers from elementary through university. Target population: Teachers, kindergarten through post-secondary. Participating schools: 10 school districts.

4. **RE:LEARNING EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY NETWORK:** The project will assist New Mexico schools that are restructuring to connect students and teachers with each other to improve student learning. Participating schools: 30 Re:Learning schools

5. **NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY ANGELITOS COLLEGE SEARCH PROGRAM:** The program provides career and college planning information, counseling services, financial aid planning, preparation for test taking, skill development sessions, and summer college placement opportunities. Target population: 130 minority high school students and their fathers. Participating schools: Gadsden, Onate, Las Cruces, Mayfield, and Hatch High Schools.

6. **SCHOOL ZONE INSTITUTE/UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO:** The program will train teachers to act as trainers in their districts to teach Architecture and Design to students through a curricula called the Architecture and Children Model. Target population: 30 teachers from selected school districts.

7. **RE:LEARNING MENTORSHIP INITIATIVE:** The program will connect 20 networking schools with developed Re:Learning sites. This initiative will promote the institutionalization of Re:Learning in the state by developing teams in schools that can assist their mentored partners in becoming proficient in the work which supports the Nine Common Re:Learning Principles. Target population: Staff in 20 networking schools.

8. **STRENGTHENING QUALITY IN SCHOOLS - TRAIN THE TRAINER PROJECT, FURR'S:** The project will provide training in Total Quality Management techniques as applied to educational processes. Target population: 30 trainers selected from schools, parents, and communities.

9. **ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM/NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS UNIVERSITY:** The program encourages students to participate in the nationally-recognized Advanced Placement Programs through student exam fee reductions and through the development of teacher training and curriculum development. Target population: Eleventh and twelfth grade high school students and teachers, with emphasis on participation by economically-disadvantaged students. Participating schools: High schools statewide.

10. **RE.-LEARNING HIGH SCHOOL TASK FORCE:** A high school task force will be created for the purpose of maximizing and leveraging the successful programs which are evident throughout the state. The goal will be for all New Mexico high school students to have the same opportunities for innovative teaching and learning. The task force will include the following groups: high school teachers, administrators, students, superintendents, school board members, colleges of education, parents and broader community.

11. **HIGH SCHOOL PARENTING PROGRAMS:** The program will provide training in parenting and care of pre-kindergarten children in approved child care training and parenting labs at Santa Fe High School.

12. **NEW MEXICO SCHOLARS PROGRAM:** While not a Special Project as defined above, the New Mexico Scholars Program (NMSP) was passed into law in 1989 (Section 21-21H-1 through 21-21H-9, NMSA). The program makes scholarship money available to certain students (1) who rank in the top five percent of the graduating class or earn an overall score of at least 25 on the ACT and (2) who come from homes with a total family income of $30,000.00 or less. The scholarship may be for up to four years of post-secondary training. Table 2 lists the number of students reported by the districts as eligible for the NMSP and the number of students reported by the districts as receiving an NMSP scholarship in 1992.

TABLE 2

DISTRICT REPORTED NEW MEXICO SCHOLARS - 1993

DISTRICT	ELIGIBLE	RECEIVING	DISTRICT	ELIGIBLE	RECEIVING
Alamogordo	31	4	Las Cruces	35	33
Albuquerque	N.A.	N.A.	Las Vegas City	4	4
Animas	1	1	Las Vegas West	4	3
Artesia	2	2	Logan	1	0
Aztec	6	0	Lordsburg	0	0
Belen	8	8	Los Alamos	0	0
Bernalillo	0	0	Los Lunas	12	0
Bloomfield	4	2	Loving	0	0
Capitan	3	2	Lovington	6	0
Carlsbad	2	2	Magdalena	0	0
Carrizozo	0	0	Maxwell	0	0
Central Cons.	1	1	Melrose	0	0
Chama	2	2	Mesa Vista	4	1
Cimarron	1	1	Mora	0	0
Clayton	2	0	Moriarty	5	3
Cloudcroft	0	0	Mosquero	0	0
Clovis	26	8	Mountainair	1	1
Cobre	1	0	Pecos	0	0
Corona	0	0	Peñasco	3	3
Cuba	2	2	Pojoaque	2	0
Deming	212	8	Portales	6	2
Des Moines	2	1	Quemado	2	1
Dexter	2	0	Questa	0	0
Dora	0	0	Raton	0	0
Dulce	0	0	Reserve	1	1
Elida	3	0	Roswell	25	25
Española	4	0	Roy	0	0
Estancia	7	4	Ruidoso	15	11
Eunice	2	2	San Jon	0	0
Farmington	11	9	Santa Fe	5	3
Floyd	1	0	Santa Rosa	0	0
Ft. Sumner	0	0	Silver City	5	5
Gadsden	32	6	Socorro	1	1
Gallup-McKinley	15	6	Springer	1	1
Grady	2	2	Taos	0	0
Grants-Cibola	6	1	Tatum	1	1
Hagerman	0	0	Texico	0	0
Hatch	2	2	Truth or Conseq.	0	0
Hobbs	4	4	Tucumcari	3	1
Hondo	0	0	Tularosa	0	0
House	1	1	Vaughn	0	0
Jal	10	12	Wagon Mound	0	0
Jemez Mountain	3	3	Zuni	0	0
Jemez Valley	1	0			
Lake Arthur	0	0	**Statewide**	532	196

STUDENT INDICATORS

Student Enrollment Trends

Between 1990-91 and 1992-93, overall student enrollment in New Mexico public schools increased 4.6 percent (2.4 percent between 1990-91 and 1991-92; 2.2 percent between 1991-92 and 1992-93). In fact, enrollment grew in all major groupings—in grades kindergarten through 6 (3.2 percent), in grades 7 through 12 (5.3 percent), and in special education (12.4 percent). (See Figure 1.)

FIGURE 1



	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
Special Education	18,782	19,664	21,120
Grades 7-12	118,396	121,458	124,701
Grades K-6	164,707	167,998	169,960

SOURCES: "Public School Pupil Membership: Funded" Reports, 1990-91, 1991-92, 1992-93

Student Ethnicity

Based on fortieth day enrollment figures, the ethnic composition of the entire student body for 1992-93 (Figure 2) was 40.8 percent Anglo, 45.8 percent Hispanic, 10.2 percent Native American, 2.3 percent African American, and 0.9 percent Asian. From 1990-91, the percentage of Anglo enrollment declined from 42.2 percent; however, both Hispanic and Native American enrollments increased—Hispanic from 44.9 percent and Native American from 9.8 percent. African American and Asian enrollment remained relatively stable.

FIGURE 2



Percent of Graduating Seniors and College Applicants With District Rankings

In 1992-93, the rate of New Mexico's high school seniors beginning the 12th grade who graduated ranged from a low of 50.0 percent (down from the prior year's 69.2 percent) to a high of 100 percent (28 districts tied). Of the districts achieving a 100 percent graduation rate, the numbers of graduates ranged from three students to 271 students. (See Table 5.)

The percentage of graduates applying to four-year institutions of higher learning ranged from a low of 9.1 percent (Tatum District, n = 2 out of 22) to a high of 100 percent (Dora District, n = 6; Floyd, n = 8). In the case of graduates applying to two-year institutions, the percentages ranged from a low of 0.0 percent (twelve districts) to a high of 72.7 percent (Tatum District, n = 16 out of 22). (See Table 5.)

Dropout Rates and District Rankings

Dropout rates and district rankings are presented in table 4 for the school years 1989-90 through 1991-92 for grades 9-12 only. The dropout rate has decreased from 9.9% in 1989-90 to 7.4% in 1991-92. In part this decrease is the result of a change in the method of calculating the dropout rate; however, it follows the trend of a declining dropout rate for the past three years. The new method for calculating the rate takes into account students who "drop back in" the following year. Because of this new method, data is not available until November for the previous school year. Hence, the data in the *Accountability Report* are one year behind.

Dropout rates for school year 1991-92 by ethnicity and gender are presented in table 3. The highest dropout rate by ethnicity is shown by African Americans at 8.9%; however this is down from 10.9% in 1990-91. Native Americans had a decrease of 5.0% in their dropout rate, Hispanics decreased 2.6%, Anglos decreased 1.6%, while Asians showed an increase of 1.0% in their dropout rate. The dropout rate for females decreased from 9.1% in 1990-91 to 7.0% in 1991-92 and males decreased from 10.3% to 7.7% in the same period.

TABLE 3
DROPUTS BY ETHNICITY AND GENDER 1991-92: GRADES 9-12

Group	Number of Dropouts	Computed Membership	Dropout Rate
Ethnicity			
Anglo	2,105	32,565	6.1%
Asian	57	922	5.8%
African American	171	1,760	8.9%
Hispanic	3,148	34,225	8.4%
Native American	752	8,976	7.7%
Total	6,233	74,448	7.4%
Gender			
Female	2,879	38,438	7.0%
Male	3,354	40,010	7.7%
Total	6,233	78,448	7.4%

TABLE 4
NEW MEXICO DROPOUT RATES: GRADES 9-12

DISTRICT	1989-90 RATE	1989-90 RANK	1990-91 RATE	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 RATE	1991-92 RANK
ALAMOGORDO	15.9	86	7.8	64	2.0	26
ALBUQUERQUE	12.1	81	12.2	81	10.4	81
ANIMAS	0.6	10	2.0	11	0.7	15
ARTESIA	7.9	60	4.3	32	3.5	37
AZTEC	7.2	55	4.1	30	4.7	52
BELEN	13.9	85	7.5	62	6.1	64
BERNALILLO	12.7	82	24.7	88	8.1	76
BLOOMFIELD	10.2	74	17.4	87	13.4	87
CAPITAN	5.6	41	5.6	44	4.1	45
CARLSBAD	7.0	52	9.9	74	5.2	58
CARRIZOZO	3.2	25	3.5	24	0.0	1
CENTRAL	6.8	49	8.0	66	4.1	45
CHAMA VALLEY	1.2	12	6.1	48	1.3	18
CIMARRON	3.4	27	4.6	37	3.4	35
CLAYTON	6.7	47	3.0	16	1.6	19
CLOUDCROFT	1.7	16	3.1	18	2.5	28
CLOVIS	6.9	50	8.3	68	6.8	69
COBRE	9.6	69	11.0	77	6.7	68
CORONA	0.0	1	3.3	22	0.0	1
CUBA	7.4	57	9.0	71	11.6	85
DEMING	9.2	67	11.8	80	12.6	86
DES MOINES	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1
DEXTER	1.4	15	9.4	72	10.7	83
DORA	4.9	35	4.1	30	1.7	21
DULCE	8.8	65	16.7	86	6.3	65
ELIDA	0.0	1	7.7	63	0.0	1
ESPANOLA	9.8	71	8.9	70	9.8	80
ESTANCIA	3.8	30	5.1	39	0.0	1
EUNICE	8.0	61	7.3	61	5.0	55
FARMINGTON	11.0	78	13.8	83	6.5	67
FLOYD	1.9	19	2.8	14	0.0	1
FT. SUMNER	8.3	63	4.3	32	3.3	34
GADSDEN	10.1	72	10.1	75	6.8	69
GALLUP	13.4	84	12.5	82	7.8	74
GRADY	0.0	1	0.0	1	1.8	23
GRANTS-CIBOLA	11.5	79	11.3	78	5.5	61
HAGERMAN	6.7	47	5.9	46	7.6	73
HATCH	7.8	59	7.0	58	17.6	88
HOBBS	8.1	62	6.8	57	2.7	30
HONDO VALLEY	7.3	56	6.7	55	7.4	72
HOUSE	3.4	27	0.0	1	0.0	1
JAL	2.2	22	3.4	23	5.2	58
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	5.0	36	14.0	85	0.0	1
JEMEZ VALLEY	1.1	11	5.4	41	1.8	23
LAKE ARTHUR	8.3	63	5.7	45	3.9	41
LAS CRUCES	10.1	72	10.7	76	7.8	74

TABLE 4, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	1989-90 RATE	1989-90 RANK	1990-91 RATE	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 RATE	1991-92 RANK
LAS VEGAS CITY	1.2	12	3.1	18	1.6	19
LAS VEGAS WEST	15.9	86	6.0	47	4.2	47
LOGAN	3.1	24	3.1	18	5.9	63
LORDSBURG	13.1	83	9.7	73	3.4	35
LOS ALAMOS	1.9	19	1.6	7	3.9	41
LOS LUNAS	7.1	54	6.4	52	3.5	37
LOVING	5.6	41	4.3	32	6.3	65
LOVINGTON	10.6	76	6.1	48	4.4	50
MAGDALENA	19.0	88	1.9	8	0.0	1
MAXWELL	5.0	36	5.4	41	2.6	29
MELROSE	3.7	29	2.2	12	2.0	26
MESA VISTA	0.0	1	0.0	1	2.9	32
MORA	7.7	58	3.0	16	1.0	17
MORIARTY	3.2	25	3.1	18	3.9	41
MOSQUERO	0.0	1	3.6	26	0.0	1
MOUNTAINAIR	1.7	16	2.5	13	2.9	32
PECOS	6.0	44	5.1	39	3.6	40
PENASCO	2.3	23	4.9	38	0.8	16
POJOAQUE	5.5	40	5.5	43	4.9	54
PORTALES	7.0	52	6.7	55	1.7	21
QUEMADO	1.7	16	4.4	36	4.8	53
QUESTA	10.8	77	7.0	58	3.5	37
RATON	4.7	34	7.9	65	6.8	69
RESERVE	1.2	12	3.6	26	0.0	1
ROSWELL	8.8	65	7.0	58	4.3	49
ROY	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1
RUIDOSO	6.9	50	8.1	67	11.0	84
SAN JON	0.0	1	1.9	8	1.8	23
SANTA FE	11.8	80	11.5	79	10.4	81
SANTA ROSA	4.4	31	2.9	15	5.1	57
SILVER CITY	5.8	43	6.2	50	4.2	47
SOCORRO	4.5	32	6.4	52	5.2	58
SPRINGER	5.0	36	4.0	29	9.0	78
TAOS	6.2	45	4.3	32	0.2	14
TATUM	4.6	33	1.9	8	4.5	51
TEXICO	5.3	39	3.5	24	2.7	30
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	10.3	75	8.5	69	9.2	79
TUCUMCARI	6.6	46	6.2	50	8.9	77
TULAROSA	9.5	68	6.6	54	5.7	62
VAUGHN	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1
WAGON MOUND	2.0	21	3.8	28	4.0	44
ZUNI	9.7	70	13.9	8	5.0	55
STATEWIDE	9.9		9.8		7.4	

TABLE 5
NEW MEXICO GRADUATION STATISTICS—1990-91 TO 1992-93

DISTRICT	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 RANK	SENIORS BEGINNING 12TH GRADE	SENIORS GRADUATING	PERCENT	1992-93 RANK	GRADS APPLYING 4 YEAR	PERCENT	GRADS APPLYING 2 YEAR	PERCENT
ALAMOGORDO	78	70	456	369	80.9%	84	251	68.02%	48	13.01%
ALBUQUERQUE	24	26	4243	3845	90.6%	62	1488	38.70%	1387	36.07%
ANIMAS	51	59	40	40	100.0%	1	22	55.00%	8	20.00%
ARTESIA	52	1	218	218	100.0%	1	120	55.05%	48	22.02%
AZTEC	43	66	195	175	89.7%	64	106	60.57%	28	16.00%
BELEN	72	83	230	204	88.7%	67	138	67.65%	34	16.67%
BERNALILLO	65	40	98	95	96.9%	34	20	21.05%	16	16.84%
BLOOMFIELD	70	82	179	154	86.0%	76	35	22.73%	53	34.42%
CAPITAN	33	1	30	28	93.3%	48	19	67.86%	100.00%	3.57%
CARLSBAD	46	27	412	362	87.9%	71	131	36.19%	112	30.94%
CARRIZOZO	1	65	19	18	94.7%	42	11	61.11%	2	11.11%
CENTRAL	44	33	383	358	93.5%	47	97	27.09%	106	29.61%
CHAMA VALLEY	76	30	35	35	100.0%	1	25	71.43%	6	17.14%
CIBOLA	87	79	283	226	79.9%	85	64	28.32%	84	37.17%
CIMARRON	1	38	31	30	96.8%	36	18	60.00%	4	13.33%
CLAYTON	1	28	41	39	95.1%	41	18	46.15%	10	25.64%
CLOUDCROFT	55	60	32	31	96.9%	35	15	48.39%	12	38.71%
CLOVIS	73	57	451	409	90.7%	61	175	42.79%	84	20.54%
COBRE	1	40	97	96	99.0%	29	86	89.58%	8	8.33%
CORONA	1	1	5	5	100.0%	1	4	80.00%	0	0.00%
CUBA	81	84	60	53	88.3%	68	8	15.09%	23	43.40%
DEMING	1	25	212	187	88.2%	69	58	31.02%	16	8.56%
DES MOINES	69	1	8	8	100.0%	1	5	62.50%	2	25.00%
DEXTER	54	74	41	35	85.4%	79	12	34.29%	6	17.14%
DORA	1	76	7	6	85.7%	77	6	100.00%	0	0.00%
DULCE	32	48	28	24	85.7%	77	12	50.00%	4	16.67%
ELIDA	1	1	8	8	100.0%	1	5	62.50%	1	12.50%
ESPANOLA	57	58	239	217	90.8%	58	55	25.35%	73	33.64%
ESTANCIA	30	1	37	37	100.0%	1	12	32.43%	5	13.51%
EUNICE	75	48	69	64	92.8%	53	3	4.69%	46	71.88%
FARMINGTON	56	38	470	421	89.6%	65	148	35.15%	100	23.75%
FLOYD	88	1	8	8	100.0%	1	8	100.00%	0	0.00%
FT. SUMNER	50	1	15	14	93.3%	48	10	71.43%	0	0.00%
GADSDEN	82	80	488	420	86.1%	75	196	46.67%	120	28.57%
GALLUP	65	56	744	675	90.7%	59	208	30.81%	210	31.11%
GRADY	1	1	16	16	100.0%	1	14	87.50%	0	0.00%
HAGERMAN	1	67	19	19	100.0%	1	0	0.00%	6	31.58%
HATCH	67	51	53	52	98.1%	32	18	34.62%	7	13.46%
HOBBS	71	73	324	304	93.8%	45	72	22.64%	204	64.15%
HONDO VALLEY	59	87	7	7	100.0%	1	1	14.29%	3	42.86%
HOUSE	1	1	5	5	100.0%	1	3	60.00%	2	40.00%
JAL	1	1	35	32	91.4%	56	10	31.25%	12	37.50%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	1	1	27	27	100.0%	1	17	62.96%	5	18.52%
JEMEZ VALLEY	46	72	51	48	94.1%	44	17	35.42%	11	22.92%
LAKE ARTHUR	45	1	8	8	100.0%	1	1	12.50%	1	12.50%
LAS CRUCES	26	31	1117	1032	92.4%	54	370	35.85%	143	13.86%
LAS VEGAS CITY	57	71	168	153	91.1%	57	85	55.56%	15	9.80%
LAS VEGAS WEST	25	43	85	78	91.8%	55	40	51.28%	20	25.64%

TABLE 5, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 RANK	SENIORS BEGINNING 12TH GRADE	SENIORS GRADUATING	PERCENT	1992-93 RANK	GRADS APPLYING 4 YEAR	PERCENT	GRADS APPLYING 2 YEAR	PERCENT
LOGAN	40	67	24	19	79.2%	87	6	31.58%	3	15.79%
LORDSBURG	35	63	44	41	93.2%	50	18	43.90%	4	9.76%
LOS ALAMOS	77	45	264	231	87.5%	72	228	98.70%	7	3.03%
LOS LUNAS	1	35	284	256	90.1%	63	179	69.92%	27	10.55%
LOVING	74	77	31	27	87.1%	74	9	33.33%	8	29.63%
LOVINGTON	41	55	183	146	79.8%	86	30	20.55%	82	56.16%
MAGDALENA	48	1	21	20	95.2%	39	10	50.00%	0	0.00%
MAXWELL	1	1	4	2	50.0%	88	1	50.00%	0	0.00%
MELROSE	59	54	27	24	88.9%	66	16	66.67%	0	0.00%
MESA VISTA	59	88	28	28	100.0%	1	8	28.57%	17	60.71%
MORA	53	1	50	50	100.0%	1	22	44.00%	2	4.00%
MORIARTY	80	35	148	142	95.9%	38	43	30.28%	3	2.11%
MOSQUERO	1	1	3	3	100.0%	1	2	66.67%	0	0.00%
MOUNTAINAIR	1	1	25	24	96.0%	37	4	16.67%	11	45.83%
PECOS	27	42	55	54	98.2%	31	8	18.60%	18	41.86%
PENASCO	28	53	51	43	84.3%	81	18	33.33%	15	27.78%
POJOAQUE	83	80	132	111	84.1%	83	45	40.54%	32	28.83%
PORTALES	38	32	188	178	94.7%	43	85	47.75%	8	4.49%
QUEMADO	1	75	13	13	100.0%	1	7	53.85%	3	23.08%
QUESTA	67	37	42	40	95.2%	39	11	27.50%	10	25.00%
RATON	38	44	102	102	100.0%	1	46	45.10%	31	30.39%
RESERVE	48	48	9	9	100.0%	1	5	55.56%	1	11.11%
ROSWELL	42	1	585	545	93.2%	51	225	41.28%	48	8.81%
ROY	1	1	7	7	100.0%	1	4	57.14%	3	42.86%
RUIDOSO	86	45	97	88	90.7%	60	44	50.00%	15	17.05%
SAN JON	59	67	11	11	100.0%	1	3	27.27%	3	27.27%
SANTA FE	85	85	630	555	88.1%	70	249	44.86%	74	13.33%
SANTA ROSA	29	1	42	42	100.0%	1	23	54.76%	16	38.10%
SILVER CITY	34	61	271	271	100.0%	1	123	45.39%	13	4.80%
SOCORRO	63	45	126	110	87.3%	73	46	41.82%	12	10.91%
SPRINGER	1	34	19	19	100.0%	1	9	47.37%	0	0.00%
TAOS	84	62	198	184	92.9%	52	104	56.52%	43	23.37%
TATUM	1	1	22	22	100.0%	1	2	9.09%	16	72.73%
TEXICO	64	77	38	32	84.2%	82	13	40.63%	11	34.38%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	36	86	88	75	85.2%	80	39	52.00%	12	16.00%
TUCUMCARI	79	64	88	86	97.7%	33	50	58.14%	6	6.98%
TULAROSA	30	52	77	72	93.5%	46	44	61.11%	0	0.00%
VAUGHN	1	1	9	9	100.0%	1	2	22.22%	2	22.22%
WAGON MOUND	1	1	10	10	100.0%	1	8	80.00%	0	0.00%
ZUNI	37	28	89	88	98.9%	30	14	15.91%	20	22.73%
STATEWIDE			15,962.0	14,484.0	90.7%		6,040	41.66%	3,662	25.26%

Source: SDE District Accountability Survey, August 1993.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS

Introduction

Student achievement is measured with several state mandated assessments. These assessments are of various types: criterion-referenced, norm-referenced, and performance-based. A criterion-referenced test is designed to provide information on the specific knowledge or skills possessed by a student. The High School Competency Examination is a criterion-referenced examination. These examinations indicate whether or not a student performs a given task satisfactorily. The student is not compared to any group of students; rather, the student's skill at a given task is evaluated. Scores on a criterion-referenced test are a measure of what the individual student knows or can do.

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), on the other hand, is a norm-referenced examination, a test designed to provide information on how well a student performs in comparison to other students; that is, a student is compared statewide and nationally to either the mathematical mean (average) or the median (middle) score of all students tested. The student, rather than demonstrating a competency on task, is placed on a continuum with all the other students tested to show the student's ability in relation to those other students.

The New Mexico Portfolio Writing Assessment is a state-mandated, performance-based examination. With a performance-based test, the student actually performs a task. With the writing assessment, the student actually produces a piece of writing under a given set of guidelines; the piece is then compared to a rubric, or a set of criteria, and scored accordingly.

The scores for the ITBS and the High School Competency Examination, state-mandated tests, are reported with district rankings. One other test is also reported here; while not a state-mandated examination, the ACT is the college entrance examination used in New Mexico. Although the ACT is a norm-referenced examination, the ACT should not be used as an indicator of the general performance of New Mexico high school students. The ACT is an indicator only of those students expressing an interest in attending college, and how well they might perform at the college level.

New Mexico Portfolio Writing Assessment--Grades 4 and 6

The Portfolio Writing Assessment, a performance-based assessment, is administered to all fourth and sixth grade students in New Mexico. A writing assessment was mandated by the Public School Reform Act (1986). Between 1986 and 1991, New Mexico schools were utilizing the Direct Writing Assessment in grades 4 and 6. This assessment provided secure prompts, revealed to the student only at the time of testing. Interest in portfolio assessment and a national trend toward assessments that are instructional led the State Department of Education to design and utilize a new approach to the assessment of student writing. In 1992, for the first time, students in grades four and six were given the opportunity to participate in the Portfolio Writing Assessment, a newly constructed writing assessment program designed by the State Department of Education in collaboration with the State Evaluation Advisory Committee and educators from across the State.

For this assessment, three prompts are provided at each grade level. Early in the school year, the teacher is provided with these prompts and a guide which assists the writer in understanding the criteria for good writing. The teacher provides lessons for the class and the student writes toward the assigned topic until both the teacher and student are satisfied that the student's piece of writing demonstrates his best efforts. This is repeated with each prompt. Pre-writing activities and drafts are stored in the student's portfolio for review and reflection. In the spring, the prompt selected for scoring by the State Department of Education is announced. The teacher and student then work together to select the best piece of writing for transcribing onto a scorable booklet. The student's writing is then scored against a set of criteria with score points ranging from 1 through 6, 6 being the highest score possible. Although not mandated for the eighth grade, districts have the option of using this instructional and assessment tool for their eighth grade students. This provides an additional checkpoint for students before they are required to pass the written composition portion of the High School Competency Examination, first administered at grade ten.

New Mexico Achievement Assessment (ITBS) -- Grades 3, 5, and 8

The New Mexico Achievement Assessment is administered to all third, fifth, and eighth grade students in New Mexico public schools. The norm-referenced test used for this purpose is the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). On a norm-referenced test, a student's score is interpreted by comparing it to the performance of other students. Whether or not a student knows more or less than other students is the important guide. The ITBS is used to obtain standardized student achievement data for nationwide and statewide comparisons in the content areas of Listening and Word Analysis (at grades K-2 only), Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Language Skills, Work-Study Skills, Mathematics Skills (comprised of concepts, problems and computation), Social Studies, and Science. The State requires that districts use the ITBS in the areas of Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Spelling, and Mathematics Skills. Districts have the option of administering any or all of the other subtests available. The results of these tests are used primarily for accountability purposes and programmatic decisions in accreditation and budget review. Median percentiles are reported. To understand these results, a median is defined as the middle score. The median national percentile is always 50. By looking at the reported scores for the norm-referenced test, the reader is able to determine how far above or below the national median a particular district has scored.

College Entrance Examination (ACT) Results

The other norm-referenced test administered in New Mexico is the ACT, used as a college entrance examination. Results of the ACT are not representative of the high school students as a whole in New Mexico; rather, ACT scores are reflective of only those high school students expressing an interest in pursuing a college education for the particular year in which the test is taken. Thus, there is no norming date for the ACT, as each year's test is normed against itself. ACT results for the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school years are presented in Table 9. For further analysis of the ACT results, please refer to the SDE's "New Mexico Enhanced ACT and SAT Results".

Both norm-referenced tests administered in New Mexico, the ITBS (1992-93 results) and the ACT (1991-92 results), are reported by district clusters in Table 10. The cluster analysis is based on five factors selected by SDE personnel on the basis of national research. The intent here is to group districts along similar socio-economic-demographic variables that influence instruction (and thereby, test results) over which the school district has no control. Further explanation and district clusters were given in the Introduction. The reader should note, however, that two rankings are given in Table 10, the district's ranking among the 88 districts, as well as a "Within Cluster Rank." When reading this table, interpretation of results should be based not only on a district's state ranking, but how the state ranking places the district when ranked within its cluster.

The New Mexico High School Competency Examination

Beginning with the ninth grade class of 1986-87, New Mexico public school students are required to pass the New Mexico High School Competency Examination (NMHSCE) to receive a New Mexico public high school diploma. The school year 1989-90 was the first year that graduating seniors were required to pass the examination. Seniors who do not pass the examination but fulfill the other course and credit requirements are given the option of graduating with a certificate of completion or returning within the next five years to retake the NMHSCE, pass it and receive a diploma. Students also may receive an exemption, waiver or modification to the exam based on their enrollment in bilingual education or special education programs (and whether or not appropriate specification is noted on the student's Individual Education Plan--I.E.P.). The NMHSCE assesses competencies in the content areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies as well as written composition. Students, taking the test for the first time in the tenth grade, must pass all six subtests in order to receive a high school diploma. Sophomores who fail any part of the NMHSCE have another chance in their junior year and two chances in their senior year to successfully complete the exam before graduation deadlines.

Test domain specifications which describe the specific knowledge and skills that are assessed by the examination were originally developed with the assistance and review of the Statewide Assessment Task Force and colleagues around the state and put into place with the first administration of the NMHSCE during the 1987-88 school year. As the exam has evolved over the past six years, new test items have been added, old ones replaced and even newer open-ended and constructed-response type items are now being piloted. These changes are leading toward a completely revised exam, with new domain specifications, which will be in existence by the 1995-96 school year. Individuals from the New Mexico Department of Education, local New Mexico school districts, institutions of higher education as well as publishers' representatives have all been, and are now being, involved in the creation and review of new test bank items.

The statewide summary (Figure 7) for the three years 1990-91 to 1992-93 which indicates the percent of tenth grade students passing the NMHSCE on their first attempt shows a continuous increase, from 74.9% in 1990-91, to 76% in 1991-92, and to 84.1% in 1992-93.

Of the 16,981 tenth grade students to attempt all six subtests in 1992-93, 84.1% passed all six subtests. This figure surpasses by eight percentage points the number of sophomores in 1991-92 who passed the whole test. Passing percentages also increased this year on five of the six individual subtests over 1991-92 (see figure 8). In specific terms progress was made in every subtest except science. The largest gain was in the area of written composition, where the percent passing rose from 92.3% in 1991-92 to 98.4% in 1992-93. The percentage passing the math subtest rose from 91.7% to 94.0%; percentage passing social studies increased from 92.8% to 94.9%; percentage passing reading went from 94.3% to 95.0%; and the percentage passing language arts increased from 92.2% to 92.9%. The only decrease in a percentage of sophomores passing any subtest from 1991-92 to 1992-93 was in the science content area where the percentage went from 93.2% to 92.1%.

A review of the results by ethnic background of tenth grade students shows an increase in percentage passing all six subtests on the first attempt for all ethnic groups for 1992-93 over 1991-92: the Anglo group increased from 88.5% to 93.8%; the Asian group increased from 85.7% to 88.8%; the Black group increased from 66.9% to 72.1%; the Hispanic group increased from 70.5% to 78.5%; and the Native American group increased from 60.6% to 70.9%.

Reading Assessment -- Grades 1 and 2

The legislation passed during the 1989 Legislative Session modified the language of the Public School Reform Act (1986) that authorized the New Mexico Reading Assessment for grades one and two. This modification removed the requirement that this assessment be norm-referenced. Since that time, a committee of reading specialists met in the 1989-90 school year to further develop and refine the reading assessment process. Their recommendations requested that each local school district select or create a reading assessment procedure to utilize in that particular district and report the aggregated data to the New Mexico Department of Education. These procedures were reviewed by local school districts and approved by the Department of Education. All New Mexico local school districts have been following these plans now for the past three years. However, an increasing awareness has been expressed that the current reporting procedures are not as instructionally beneficial to the individual schools and classroom teachers as they could be. Therefore, during the 1992-93 school year, a Reading Assessment Review Committee, comprised of state and local school district personnel familiar with early childhood reading strategies, met to attempt to create an optional reading assessment model that could be disseminated statewide for use during 1993-94. Local school districts would still have options concerning the use of appropriate reading assessment procedures for their particular student populations, but they would now have another model of reading assessment (to include literacy assessment) at their disposal. This new optional reading assessment model is being disseminated during the fall of 1993. Local school districts are also encouraged to work with the New Mexico Department of Education in developing, creating, and/or revising any new or revised reading assessment models that may be appropriate for their student populations. Since the reading assessment being used by districts are not comparable, no comparison or rankings are presented.

FIGURE 3

NEW MEXICO PORTFOLIO WRITING ASSESSMENT

1992-93 Statewide Summary for Grades 4 and 6

Holistic Score	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
Grade 4						
Number	1,339	12,290	6,857	1,539	212	20
Percent	6.0%	55.2%	30.8%	6.9%	1.0%	0.1%
Grade 6						
Number	607	5,465	8,893	4,781	1,427	137
Percent	2.9%	25.7%	41.7%	22.4%	6.7%	0.6%

NOTE: Percentages based on scorable papers only.

SDE: October 1993

FIGURE 4

NEW MEXICO ITBS/J PERCENTILE SCORE BY CONTENT AREA GRADE 3



	Vocabulary	Reading Comprehension	Math Composite	Language Skills	Social Studies	Science	Work-Study
1991-92	39	41	37	40	38	47	37
1992-93	40	39	39	41	41	48	38

Normed 1991
First Administered 1991-92
SDE: October 1993

FIGURE 5

NEW MEXICO ITBS/J PERCENTILE SCORE BY CONTENT AREA GRADE 5



1991-92	40	47	42	41	42	58	45
1992-93	42	47	41	40	39	53	47

Normed 1991
First Administered 1991-92
SDE: October 1993

FIGURE 6

NEW MEXICO ITBS/J PERCENTILE SCORE BY CONTENT AREA GRADE 8



1991-92	34	46	39	44	41	43	43
1992-93	34	44	39	44	37	47	44

Normed 1991
First Administered 1991-92
SDE: October 1993

FIGURE 7

HIGH SCHOOL COMPETENCY EXAMINATION
Percentage of 10th Grade Students Passing All Six Subtests Attempted



SDE: October 1993

FIGURE 8

HIGH SCHOOL COMPETENCY EXAMINATION
Performance by Subtests
Grade 10: Percent Passing on First Attempt



	Read	Lang Arts	Math	Sci	Soc Stud	Comp
90-91	91.1%	91.9%	90.6%	90.7%	90.1%	95.7%
91-92	94.3%	92.2%	91.7%	93.2%	92.8%	92.3%
92-93	95.0%	92.9%	94.0%	92.1%	94.9%	98.4%

All Scores Exclude Special Education and '0' Subtests
SDE: October 1993

TABLE 6

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
ALAMOGORDO	NUMBER	27	278	213	85	10	1
	PERCENT	4.40%	45.28%	34.69%	13.84%	1.63%	0.16%
ALBUQUERQUE	NUMBER	276	3334	2062	401	56	3
	PERCENT	4.50%	54.37%	33.63%	6.54%	0.91%	0.50%
ANIMAS	NUMBER	0	16	19	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	44.44%	52.78%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%
ARTESIA	NUMBER	1	91	136	70	7	0
	PERCENT	0.33%	29.84%	44.59%	22.95%	2.30%	0.00%
AZTEC	NUMBER	28	90	64	13	1	0
	PERCENT	14.29%	45.92%	32.65%	6.63%	0.51%	0.00%
BELEN	NUMBER	25	177	95	13	1	0
	PERCENT	8.04%	56.91%	30.55%	4.18%	0.32%	0.00%
BERNALILLO	NUMBER	10	161	53	9	1	0
	PERCENT	4.27%	68.80%	22.65%	3.85%	0.43%	0.00%
BLOOMFIELD	NUMBER	30	159	36	9	2	0
	PERCENT	12.71%	67.37%	15.25%	3.81%	0.85%	0.00%
CAPITAN	NUMBER	0	27	32	3	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	43.55%	51.61%	4.84%	0.00%	0.00%
CARLSBAD	NUMBER	34	279	170	45	5	2
	PERCENT	6.36%	52.15%	31.78%	8.41%	0.93%	0.37%
CARRIZOZO	NUMBER	1	6	8	2	0	0
	PERCENT	5.88%	35.29%	47.06%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%
CENTRAL	NUMBER	48	350	102	15	1	0
	PERCENT	9.30%	67.83%	19.77%	2.91%	0.19%	0.00%
CHAMA	NUMBER	0	29	17	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	61.70%	36.17%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%
CIMARRON	NUMBER	0	14	20	5	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	35.00%	50.00%	12.50%	2.50%	0.00%
CLAYTON	NUMBER	0	16	34	5	0	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	28.57%	60.71%	8.93%	0.00%	1.79%
CLOUDCROFT	NUMBER	0	10	24	6	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	24.39%	58.54%	14.63%	2.44%	0.00%
CLOVIS	NUMBER	50	393	195	43	5	0
	PERCENT	7.29%	57.29%	28.43%	6.27%	0.73%	0.00%
COBRE	NUMBER	14	78	40	9	0	0
	PERCENT	9.93%	55.32%	28.37%	6.38%	0.00%	0.00%
CORONA	NUMBER	0	8	2	0	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 6, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
CUBA	NUMBER	1	26	8	0	0	0
	PERCENT	2.86%	74.29%	22.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DEMING	NUMBER	21	220	95	18	2	0
	PERCENT	5.90%	61.80%	26.69%	5.06%	0.56%	0.00%
DES MOINES	NUMBER	0	0	2	7	4	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	15.38%	53.85%	30.77%	0.00%
DEXTER	NUMBER	0	24	23	10	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	41.38%	39.66%	17.24%	1.72%	0.00%
DORA	NUMBER	3	13	1	0	0	0
	PERCENT	17.65%	76.47%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
DULCE	NUMBER	12	28	7	1	0	0
	PERCENT	25.00%	58.33%	14.58%	2.08%	0.00%	0.00%
ELIDA	NUMBER	0	0	8	2	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ESPANOLA	NUMBER	23	264	105	10	0	0
	PERCENT	5.72%	65.67%	26.12%	2.49%	0.00%	0.00%
ESTANCIA	NUMBER	7	21	21	4	1	0
	PERCENT	12.96%	38.89%	38.89%	7.41%	1.85%	0.00%
EUNICE	NUMBER	4	43	15	3	0	0
	PERCENT	6.15%	66.15%	23.08%	4.62%	0.00%	0.00%
FARMINGTON	NUMBER	39	386	236	61	12	1
	PERCENT	5.31%	52.52%	32.11%	8.30%	1.63%	0.14%
FLOYD	NUMBER	0	6	10	2	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	33.33%	55.56%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
FT. SUMNER	NUMBER	1	10	12	4	1	1
	PERCENT	3.45%	34.48%	41.38%	13.79%	3.45%	3.45%
GADSDEN	NUMBER	70	369	122	14	0	0
	PERCENT	12.17%	64.17%	21.22%	2.43%	0.00%	0.00%
GALLUP-MCKINLEY	NUMBER	101	585	202	25	0	0
	PERCENT	11.06%	64.07%	22.12%	2.74%	0.00%	0.00%
GRADY	NUMBER	0	4	6	0	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	NUMBER	25	168	45	1	0	0
	PERCENT	10.46%	70.29%	18.83%	0.42%	0.00%	0.00%
HAGERMAN	NUMBER	0	20	15	6	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	48.78%	36.59%	14.63%	0.00%	0.00%
HATCH	NUMBER	10	54	13	5	1	0
	PERCENT	12.05%	65.06%	15.66%	6.02%	1.20%	0.00%

TABLE 6, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
HOBBS	NUMBER	26	328	205	64	17	6
	PERCENT	4.02%	50.77%	31.73%	9.91%	2.63%	0.93%
HONDO	NUMBER	0	0	2	5	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	71.43%	0.00%	0.00%
HOUSE	NUMBER	0	1	4	2	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	14.29%	57.14%	28.57%	0.00%	0.00%
JAL	NUMBER	2	32	10	0	0	0
	PERCENT	4.55%	72.73%	22.73%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	NUMBER	4	23	9	1	1	0
	PERCENT	10.53%	60.53%	23.68%	2.63%	2.63%	0.00%
JEMEZ VALLEY	NUMBER	5	50	36	2	1	1
	PERCENT	5.26%	52.63%	37.89%	2.11%	1.05%	1.05%
LAKE ARTHUR	NUMBER	5	7	0	0	0	0
	PERCENT	41.67%	58.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
LAS CRUCES	NUMBER	57	814	436	89	13	0
	PERCENT	4.05%	57.77%	30.94%	6.32%	0.92%	0.00%
LAS VEGAS CITY	NUMBER	26	134	50	5	0	0
	PERCENT	12.09%	62.33%	23.26%	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%
LAS VEGAS WEST	NUMBER	7	93	49	10	1	0
	PERCENT	4.38%	58.13%	30.63%	6.25%	0.63%	0.00%
LOGAN	NUMBER	0	0	6	5	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	41.67%	8.33%	0.00%
LOR[illegible]SBURG	NUMBER	4	20	22	11	1	0
	PERCENT	6.90%	34.48%	37.93%	18.97%	1.72%	0.00%
LOS ALAMOS	NUMBER	2	66	107	64	12	2
	PERCENT	0.79%	26.09%	42.29%	25.30%	4.74%	0.79%
LOS LUNAS	NUMBER	11	259	170	38	6	1
	PERCENT	2.27%	53.40%	35.05%	7.84%	1.24%	0.21%
LOVING	NUMBER	4	24	7	1	0	0
	PERCENT	11.11%	66.67%	19.44%	2.78%	0.00%	0.00%
LOVINGTON	NUMBER	37	154	56	4	0	0
	PERCENT	14.74%	61.35%	22.31%	1.59%	0.00%	0.00%
MAGDALENA	NUMBER	8	14	4	0	0	0
	PERCENT	30.77%	53.85%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAXWELL	NUMBER	1	6	0	0	0	0
	PERCENT	14.29%	85.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MELROSE	NUMBER	4	7	5	2	0	0
	PERCENT	22.22%	38.89%	27.78%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 6, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
MESA VISTA	NUMBER	3	20	4	7	2	0
	PERCENT	8.33%	55.56%	11.11%	19.44%	5.56%	0.00%
MORA	NUMBER	2	38	21	2	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	4.76%	66.67%	26.98%	1.59%	0.00%
MORIARTY	NUMBER	5	133	72	16	4	0
	PERCENT	2.17%	57.83%	31.30%	6.96%	1.74%	0.00%
MOSQUERO	NUMBER	0	1	0	0	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MOUNTAINAIR	NUMBER	1	15	11	2	0	1
	PERCENT	3.33%	50.00%	36.67%	6.67%	0.00%	3.33%
PECOS	NUMBER	1	18	23	5	0	0
	PERCENT	2.13%	38.30%	48.94%	10.64%	0.00%	0.00%
PENASCO	NUMBER	0	35	15	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	68.63%	29.41%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%
POJOAQUE	NUMBER	16	72	40	8	0	0
	PERCENT	11.76%	52.94%	29.41%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%
PORTALES	NUMBER	32	158	49	4	0	0
	PERCENT	13.17%	65.02%	20.16%	1.65%	0.00%	0.00%
QUEMADO	NUMBER	0	0	5	7	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	41.67%	58.33%	0.00%	0.00%
QUESTA	NUMBER	10	21	18	1	0	0
	PERCENT	20.00%	42.00%	36.00%	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%
RATON	NUMBER	11	73	24	5	0	0
	PERCENT	9.73%	64.60%	21.24%	4.42%	0.00%	0.00%
RESERVE	NUMBER	0	7	4	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%
ROSWELL	NUMBER	58	428	231	61	1	0
	PERCENT	7.45%	54.94%	29.65%	7.83%	0.13%	0.00%
ROY	NUMBER	0	1	2	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
RUIDOSO	NUMBER	12	73	52	16	3	0
	PERCENT	7.69%	46.79%	33.33%	10.26%	1.92%	0.00%
SAN JON	NUMBER	0	10	3	0	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	76.92%	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
SANTA FE	NUMBER	22	466	303	81	19	0
	PERCENT	2.47%	52.30%	34.01%	9.09%	2.13%	0.00%
SANTA ROSA	NUMBER	2	33	34	3	0	0
	PERCENT	2.78%	45.83%	47.22%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 6, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
SILVER	NUMBER	32	124	60	15	4	0
	PERCENT	13.62%	52.77%	25.53%	6.38%	1.70%	0.00%
SOCORRO	NUMBER	14	65	47	24	2	0
	PERCENT	9.21%	42.76%	30.92%	15.79%	1.32%	0.00%
SPRINGER	NUMBER	1	17	3	0	0	0
	PERCENT	4.76%	80.95%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TAOS	NUMBER	21	113	83	5	1	0
	PERCENT	9.42%	50.67%	37.22%	2.24%	0.45%	0.00%
TATUM	NUMBER	3	10	5	1	1	0
	PERCENT	15.00%	50.00%	25.00%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%
TEXICO	NUMBER	5	22	7	0	0	0
	PERCENT	14.71%	64.71%	20.59%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	NUMBER	1	63	53	8	1	0
	PERCENT	0.79%	50.00%	42.06%	6.35%	0.79%	0.00%
TUCUMCARI	NUMBER	6	95	10	0	0	0
	PERCENT	5.41%	85.59%	9.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TULAROSA	NUMBER	0	24	25	3	5	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	42.11%	43.86%	5.26%	8.77%	0.00%
VAUGHN	NUMBER	0	8	2	0	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
WAGON MOUND	NUMBER	0	3	3	3	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
ZUNI	NUMBER	3	94	24	9	1	0
	PERCENT	2.29%	71.76%	18.32%	6.87%	0.76%	0.00%
STATEWIDE	NUMBER	1,339	12,290	6,857	1,539	212	20
	PERCENT	6.0%	55.2%	30.8%	6.9%	1.0%	0.1%

TABLE 7

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 6
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
ALAMOGORDO	NUMBER	10	120	232	151	42	6
	PERCENT	1.78%	21.39%	41.35%	26.92%	7.49%	1.07%
ALBUQUERQUE	NUMBER	96	1139	2377	1347	375	38
	PERCENT	1.79%	21.20%	44.25%	25.07%	6.98%	0.71%
ANIMAS	NUMBER	0	4	9	13	5	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	12.50%	28.13%	40.63%	15.63%	3.13%
ARTESIA	NUMBER	1	29	102	63	30	0
	PERCENT	0.44%	12.89%	45.33%	28.00%	13.33%	0.00
AZTEC	NUMBER	2	76	99	42	9	4
	PERCENT	0.86%	32.76%	42.67%	18.10%	3.88%	1.72%
BELEN	NUMBER	9	112	132	75	15	1
	PERCENT	2.62%	32.56%	38.37%	21.80%	4.36%	0.29%
BERNALILLO	NUMBER	16	87	67	33	5	2
	PERCENT	7.62%	41.43%	31.90%	15.71%	2.38%	0.95%
BLOOMFIELD	NUMBER	18	105	83	43	8	1
	PERCENT	6.98%	40.70%	32.17%	16.67%	3.10%	0.39%
CAPITAN	NUMBER	0	6	22	10	6	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	13.33%	48.89%	22.22%	13.33%	2.22%
CARLSBAD	NUMBER	21	159	230	74	32	3
	PERCENT	4.05%	30.64%	44.32%	14.26%	6.17%	0.58%
CARRIZOZO	NUMBER	0	0	2	11	3	2
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	61.11%	16.67%	11.11%
CENTRAL	NUMBER	12	102	227	120	18	1
	PERCENT	2.50%	21.25%	47.29%	25.00%	3.75%	0.21%
CHAMA	NUMBER	0	13	15	7	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	35.14%	40.54%	18.92%	5.41%	0.00%
CIMARRON	NUMBER	0	5	22	17	7	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	9.80%	43.14%	33.33%	13.73%	0.00%
CLAYTON	NUMBER	0	7	22	10	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	17.50%	55.00%	25.00%	2.50%	0.00%
CLOUDCROFT	NUMBER	0	1	13	17	14	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	2.17%	28.26%	36.96%	30.43%	2.17%
CLOVIS	NUMBER	28	233	245	109	35	2
	PERCENT	4.29%	35.74%	37.58%	16.72%	5.37%	0.31%
COBRE	NUMBER	17	69	46	3	1	0
	PERCENT	12.50%	50.74%	33.82%	2.21%	0.74%	0.00%
CORONA	NUMBER	1	3	0	2	0	0
	PERCENT	16.67%	50.00%	0.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 7, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 6
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
CUBA	NUMBER	0	5	30	11	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	10.42%	62.50%	22.92%	4.17%	0.00%
DEMING	NUMBER	12	51	127	68	28	1
	PERCENT	4.18%	17.77%	44.25%	23.69%	9.76%	0.35%
DES MOINES	NUMBER	0	3	10	5	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	15.79%	52.63%	26.32%	5.26%	0.00%
DEXTER	NUMBER	1	29	34	16	3	1
	PERCENT	1.19%	34.52%	40.48%	19.05%	3.57%	1.19%
DORA	NUMBER	0	11	5	4	3	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	47.83%	21.74%	17.39%	13.04%	0.00%
DULCE	NUMBER	0	5	14	12	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	15.15%	42.42%	36.36%	6.06%	0.00%
ELIDA	NUMBER	0	1	4	3	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	11.11%	44.44%	33.33%	11.11%	0.00%
ESPANOLA	NUMBER	18	157	170	68	8	0
	PERCENT	4.28%	37.29%	40.38%	16.15%	1.90%	0.00%
ESTANCIA	NUMBER	2	25	21	3	2	0
	PERCENT	3.77%	47.17%	39.62%	5.66%	3.77%	0.00%
EUNICE	NUMBER	0	16	34	13	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	24.62%	52.31%	20.00%	3.08%	0.00%
FARMINGTON	NUMBER	3	101	323	204	60	2
	PERCENT	0.43%	14.57%	46.61%	29.44%	8.66%	0.29%
FLOYD	NUMBER	0	3	4	6	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	21.43%	28.57%	42.86%	7.14%	0.00%
FT. SUMNER	NUMBER	0	13	17	6	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	34.21%	44.74%	15.79%	5.26%	0.00%
GADSDEN	NUMBER	51	267	268	70	8	1
	PERCENT	7.67%	40.15%	40.30%	10.53%	1.20%	0.15%
GALLUP-MCKINLEY	NUMBER	48	279	328	135	22	1
	PERCENT	5.90%	34.32%	40.34%	16.61%	2.71%	0.12%
GRADY	NUMBER	0	0	1	6	4	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	54.55%	36.36%	0.00%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	NUMBER	6	55	112	64	7	0
	PERCENT	2.46%	22.54%	45.90%	26.23%	2.87%	0.00%
HAGERMAN	NUMBER	1	8	15	3	0	0
	PERCENT	3.70%	29.63%	55.56%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%
HATCH	NUMBER	0	8	37	25	11	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	9.88%	45.68%	30.86%	13.58%	0.00%

TABLE 7, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 6
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
HOBBS	NUMBER	23	197	[illegible]	141	42	5
	PERCENT	3.41%	29.23%	39.47%	20.92%	6.23%	0.74%
HONDO	NUMBER	0	0	2	6	3	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	25.00%	8.33%
HOUSE	NUMBER	1	1	1	1	0	0
	PERCENT	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
JAL	NUMBER	0	7	19	9	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	18.92%	51.35%	24.32%	5.41%	0.00%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	NUMBER	3	5	19	7	2	0
	PERCENT	8.33%	13.89%	52.78%	19.44%	5.56%	0.00%
JEMEZ VALLEY	NUMBER	2	26	34	27	14	1
	PERCENT	1.92%	25.00%	32.69%	25.96%	13.46%	0.96%
LAKE ARTHUR	NUMBER	2	6	6	3	1	0
	PERCENT	11.11%	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%	5.56%	0.00%
LAS CRUCES	NUMBER	31	332	568	306	115	19
	PERCENT	2.26%	24.22%	41.43%	22.32%	8.39%	1.39%
LAS VEGAS CITY	NUMBER	0	59	90	51	10	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	27.96%	42.65%	24.17%	4.74%	0.47%
LAS VEGAS WEST	NUMBER	13	56	63	17	1	0
	PERCENT	8.67%	37.33%	42.00%	11.33%	0.67%	0.00%
LOGAN	NUMBER	0	5	9	3	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	27.78%	50.00%	16.67%	5.56%	0.00%
LORDSBURG	NUMBER	4	43	16	0	0	0
	PERCENT	6.35%	68.25%	25.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
LOS ALAMOS	NUMBER	1	10	78	98	44	6
	PERCENT	0.42%	4.22%	32.91%	41.35%	18.57%	2.53%
LOS LUNAS	NUMBER	18	145	223	106	18	1
	PERCENT	3.52%	28.38%	43.64%	20.74%	3.52%	0.20%
LOVING	NUMBER	1	12	20	2	1	0
	PERCENT	2.78%	33.33%	55.56%	5.56%	2.78%	0.00%
LOVINGTON	NUMBER	10	95	76	30	8	1
	PERCENT	4.55%	43.18%	34.55%	13.64%	3.64%	0.45%
MAGDALENA	NUMBER	1	6	8	3	0	0
	PERCENT	5.56%	33.33%	44.44%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
MAXWELL	NUMBER	0	3	5	3	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	25.00%	41.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0.00%
MELROSE	NUMBER	1	14	5	1	0	0
	PERCENT	4.76%	66.67%	23.81%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 7, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 6
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
MESA VISTA	NUMBER	4	10	11	7	1	0
	PERCENT	12.12%	30.30%	33.33%	21.21%	3.03%	0.00%
MORA	NUMBER	1	20	24	25	3	0
	PERCENT	1.37%	27.40%	32.88%	34.25%	4.11%	0.00%
MORIARTY	NUMBER	0	36	84	52	40	3
	PERCENT	0.00%	16.74%	39.07%	24.19%	18.60%	1.40%
MOSQUERO	NUMBER	0	0	0	2	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%
MOUNTAINAIR	NUMBER	3	13	19	2	2	0
	PERCENT	7.69%	33.33%	48.72%	5.13%	5.13%	0.00%
PECOS	NUMBER	0	15	24	10	5	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	27.78%	44.44%	18.52%	9.26%	0.00%
PENASCO	NUMBER	1	9	22	21	5	0
	PERCENT	1.72%	15.52%	37.93%	36.21%	8.62%	0.00%
POJOAQUE	NUMBER	7	49	53	27	5	1
	PERCENT	4.93%	34.51%	37.32%	19.01%	3.52%	0.70%
PORTALES	NUMBER	5	58	99	50	10	1
	PERCENT	2.24%	26.01%	44.39%	22.42%	4.48%	0.45%
QUEMADO	NUMBER	0	0	3	10	2	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	66.67%	13.33%	0.00%
QUESTA	NUMBER	0	4	20	19	8	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	7.69%	38.46%	36.54%	15.38%	1.92%
RATON	NUMBER	10	49	38	14	2	0
	PERCENT	8.85%	43.36%	33.63%	12.39%	1.77%	0.00%
RESERVE	NUMBER	0	3	7	7	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	16.67%	38.89%	38.89%	5.56%	0.00%
ROSWELL	NUMBER	40	235	325	154	51	4
	PERCENT	4.94%	29.05%	40.17%	19.04%	6.30%	0.49%
ROY	NUMBER	0	2	3	1	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
RUIDOSO	NUMBER	8	44	48	24	10	0
	PERCENT	5.97%	32.84%	35.82%	17.91%	7.46%	0.00%
SAN JON	NUMBER	0	8	7	3	1	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	42.11%	36.84%	15.79%	5.26%	0.00%
SANTA FE	NUMBER	9	176	389	297	121	10
	PERCENT	0.90%	17.56%	38.82%	29.64%	12.08%	1.00%
SANTA ROSA	NUMBER	5	31	23	4	0	0
	PERCENT	7.94%	49.21%	36.51%	6.35%	0.00%	0.00%

TABLE 7, CONTINUED

1992-93 WRITING ASSESSMENT: GRADE 6
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS AT EACH HOLISTIC SCORE

DISTRICT	HOLISTIC SCORE	1 & 1.5	2 & 2.5	3 & 3.5	4 & 4.5	5 & 5.5	6
SILVER	NUMBER	1	30	155	67	20	2
	PERCENT	0.36%	10.91%	56.36%	24.36%	7.27%	0.73%
SOCORRO	NUMBER	6	42	38	27	6	1
	PERCENT	5.00%	35.00%	31.67%	22.50%	5.00%	0.83%
SPRINGER	NUMBER	1	20	6	0	0	0
	PERCENT	3.70%	74.07%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TAOS	NUMBER	5	61	111	50	19	0
	PERCENT	2.03%	24.80%	45.12%	20.33%	7.72%	0.00%
TATUM	NUMBER	0	10	9	3	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	45.45%	40.91%	13.64%	0.00%	0.00%
TEXICO	NUMBER	0	13	20	8	3	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	29.55%	45.45%	18.18%	6.82%	0.00%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	NUMBER	4	37	42	13	4	0
	PERCENT	3.81%	35.24%	40.00%	17.14%	3.81%	0.00%
TUCUMCARI	NUMBER	6	25	45	26	4	0
	PERCENT	5.66%	23.58%	42.45%	24.53%	3.77%	0.00%
TULAROSA	NUMBER	4	27	42	12	4	2
	PERCENT	4.40%	29.67%	46.15%	13.19%	4.40%	2.20%
VAUGHN	NUMBER	0	1	4	5	3	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	7.69%	30.77%	38.46%	23.08%	0.00%
WAGON MOUND	NUMBER	0	1	9	5	0	0
	PERCENT	0.00%	6.67%	60.00%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
ZUNI	NUMBER	0	13	44	24	9	1
	PERCENT	0.00%	14.29%	48.35%	26.37%	9.89%	1.10%
STATEWIDE	NUMBER	607	5,465	8,893	4,781	1,427	137
	PERCENT	2.9%	25.7%	41.7%	22.4%	6.7%	0.6%

TABLE 8

1992-93 ITBS/J BASIC COMPOSITE SCORES: GRADES 3, 5, AND 8 BASED ON MEDIAN PERCENTILE

	GRADE 3		GRADE 5		GRADE 8	
DISTRICT	SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK
ALAMOGORDO	49	21	48	26	44	24
ALBUQUERQUE	42	40	48	26	45	19
ANIMAS	37	54	45	37	52	12
ARTESIA	49	21	51	19	39	36
AZTEC	56	13	51	19	45	19
BELEN	35	56	40	52	33	59
BERNALILLO	25	75	26	80	26	78
BLOOMFIELD*	35	56	40	52	N/A	N/A
CAPITAN	51	20	65	3	41	31
CARLSBAD	46	32	48	26	37	43
CARRIZOZO	63	7	47	35	61	5
CENTRAL CONS.	28	71	26	80	28	75
CHAMA	34	66	40	52	33	5
CIMARRON	63	7	51	19	57	7
CLAYTON	49	21	56	14	54	9
CLOUDCROFT	16	85	51	19	59	6
CLOVIS	49	21	42	46	41	31
COBRE CONS.	35	56	34	70	29	71
CORONA	39	48	13	88	29	71
CUBA	28	71	19	84	29	71
DEMING	35	56	34	70	35	52
DES MOINES	52	16	61	9	41	31
DEXTER	32	68	29	77	32	64
DORA	75	2	59	11	31	65
DULCE	18	84	40	52	20	85
ELIDA	73	3	40	52	70	1
ESPANOLA	25	75	31	76	31	65
ESTANCIA	59	12	62	6	35	52
EUNICE	54	15	45	37	29	71
FARMINGTON	46	32	48	26	43	25
FLOYD	22	80	34	70	43	25
FT. SUMNER	49	21	50	25	43	25
GADSDEN	25	75	23	82	21	83
GALLUP	16	85	19	84	21	83
GRADY	56	13	54	16	66	3
GRANTS-CIBOLA	28	71	40	52	35	52
HAGERMAN	25	75	37	63	26	78
HATCH	19	82	34	70	50	15
HOBBS	46	32	42	46	35	52
HONDO	39	48	45	37	33	59
HOUSE	37	54	72	1	52	12
JAL	49	21	47	35	45	19
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	19	82	17	87	28	75
JEMEZ VALLEY	39	48	40	52	39	36
LAKE ARTHUR	25	75	45	37	45	19
LAS CRUCES	35	56	45	37	37	43
LAS VEGAS CITY	46	32	51	19	38	42
LAS VEGAS WEST	35	56	34	70	23	82
LOGAN	52	16	59	11	66	3
LORDSBURG	41	46	42	46	37	43
LOS ALAMOS	70	4	72	1	70	1
LOS LUNAS	35	56	36	68	31	65
LOVING	42	40	37	63	40	35
LOVINGTON	42	40	34	70	33	59
MAGDALENA	22	80	62	6	41	31
MAXWELL	68	6	48	26	25	81
MELROSE	63	7	59	11	52	12

TABLE 8, CONTINUED

1992-93 ITBS/J BASIC COMPOSITE SCORES: GRADES 3, 5, AND 8 BASED ON MEDIAN PERCENTILE

	GRADE 3		GRADE 5		GRADE 8	
DISTRICT	SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK
MESA VISTA	52	16	48	26	31	65
MORA	44	37	29	77	31	65
MORIARTY	49	21	56	14	50	15
MOSQUERO	61	11	48	26	57	7
MOUNTAINAIR	44	37	45	37	28	75
PECOS	34	66	42	46	31	65
PENASCO	49	21	42	46	36	50
POJOAQUE	41	46	42	46	36	50
PORTALES	52	16	48	26	53	10
QUEMADO	49	21	37	63	50	15
QUESTA	35	56	45	37	45	19
RATON	35	56	40	52	35	52
RESERVE	70	4	62	6	43	25
ROSWELL	42	40	45	37	43	25
ROY	44	37	54	16	53	10
RUIDOSO	42	40	40	52	37	43
SAN JON	79	1	53	18	39	36
SANTA FE	35	56	51	19	47	18
SANTA ROSA	39	48	40	52	37	43
SILVER CITY	28	71	37	63	37	43
SOCORRO	42	40	36	68	39	36
SPRINGER	63	7	61	9	33	59
TAOS	39	48	40	52	43	25
TATUM	49	21	64	5	35	52
TEXICO	49	21	65	3	37	43
TRUTH OR CONSEQ	32	68	45	37	35	52
TUCUMCARI	46	32	48	26	39	36
TULAROSA	39	48	37	63	26	78
VAUGHN	31	70	28	79	39	36
WAGON MOUND	16	85	19	84	17	86
ZUNI	11	88	22	83	13	87
STATEWIDE	39		42		39	

* Unable to publish a basic composite score for Bloomfield because all subtests were not administered.

TABLE 9

ACT COMPOSITE SCORES AND DISTRICT RANKINGS

DISTRICT	1990-91		1991-92		DISTRICT	1990-91		1991-92	
	SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK		SCORE	RANK	SCORE	RANK
ALAMOGORDO	20.7	7	21.2	6	LAKE ARTHUR	19.2	39	16.3	85
ALBUQUERQUE	21.3	3	21.2	6	LAS CRUCES	20.7	7	20.6	12
ANIMAS	17.4	69	18.4	49	LAS VEGAS CITY	19.0	43	19.5	30
ARTESIA	19.6	31	19.5	30	LAS VEGAS WEST	16.8	79	16.9	79
AZTEC	19.7	29	19.1	37	LOGAN	19.6	31	18.7	42
BELEN	20.1	20	19	40	LORDSBURG	17.6	63	17.6	64
BERNALILLO	17.4	69	17.5	69	LOS ALAMOS	24.1	1	24.8	1
BLOOMFIELD	19.9	26	20.9	9	LOS LUNAS	20.1	20	19.9	22
CAPITAN	20.0	23	18.2	50	LOVING	15.8	85	16.9	79
CARLSBAD	20.6	11	20.2	16	LOVINGTON	19.2	39	19.3	34
CARRIZOZO	21.0	4	22.6	3	MAGDALENA	18.4	51	17.6	64
CENTRAL	16.9	78	17.1	77	MAXWELL	18.0	58	19.4	33
CHAMA VALLEY	18.2	53	17.5	69	MELROSE	19.4	37	19.1	37
CIMARRON	17.6	63	18	56	MESA VISTA	17.6	63	16	86
CLAYTON	19.0	43	21.4	5	MORA	18.0	58	19.3	34
CLOUDCROFT	20.7	7	20.6	12	MORIARTY	21.5	2	21.6	4
CLOVIS	20.9	5	20.9	9	MOSQUERO	20.0	23	16.4	84
COBRE	18.0	58	17.7	61	MOUNTAINAIR	16.8	79	16.5	83
CORONA	19.5	35	18	56	PECOS	15.4	86	18	56
CUBA	17.5	67	17.5	69	PENASCO	20.7	7	18.5	46
DEMING	19.7	29	19.6	28	POJOAQUE	18.9	48	20	18
DES MOINES	19.1	42	17.6	64	PORTALES	20.4	16	20.6	12
DEXTER	19.0	43	18.2	50	QUEMADO	18.7	50	19.6	28
DORA	20.5	14	17.6	64	QUESTA	16.0	84	16.9	79
DULCE	17.6	63	15.9	87	RATON	20.5	14	18.6	43
ELIDA	17.8	62	17.7	61	RESERVE	20.1	20	21.1	8
ESPANOLA	17.3	74	17.9	59	ROSWELL	20.6	11	20.7	11
ESTANCIA	19.5	35	18.6	43	ROY	20.4	16	20	18
EUNICE	17.4	69	18.2	50	RUIDOSO	19.9	26	19.8	26
FARMINGTON	20.6	11	19.9	22	SAN JON	20.0	23	17.6	64
FLOYD	15.4	86	17.7	61	SANTA FE	20.9	5	20.5	15
FT. SUMNER	18.8	49	18.5	46	SANTA ROSA	20.4	16	18.6	43
GADSDEN	17.5	67	18.1	54	SILVER CITY	19.2	39	19.5	30
GALLUP	17.1	76	17	78	SOCORRO	19.6	31	19.9	22
GRADY	16.1	83	20	18	SPRINGER	16.8	79	17.3	73
GRANTS-CIBOLA	18.4	51	19	40	TAOS	19.0	43	19.7	27
HAGERMAN	19.8	28	17.5	69	TATUM	17.9	61	18.2	50
HATCH	17.4	69	17.9	59	TEXICO	17.1	76	19.1	37
HOBBS	20.3	19	20.1	17	TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	18.1	55	19.9	22
HONDO VALLEY	16.7	82	17.2	75	TUCUMCARI	18.1	55	20	18
HOUSE	17.2	75	22.8	2	TULAROSA	18.1	55	18.1	54
JAL	19.6	31	18.5	46	VAUGHN	19.0	43	19.3	34
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	17.4	69	16.6	82	WAGON MOUND	19.3	38	17.3	73
JEMEZ VALLEY	18.2	53	17.2	75	ZUNI	15.4	86	14.9	88

TABLE 10

1992-93 ITBS/J AND 1991-92 ACT RANKINGS BY SCHOOL CLUSTER

	ITBS GRADE 3		ITBS GRADE 5		ITBS GRADE 8		ACT SCORES	
DISTRICT	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1991-92 STATE RANK	1991-92 CLUSTER RANK
ALBUQUERQUE	40	6	26	5	19	4	6	2
ARTESIA	21	3	19	2	36	6	30	12
BELEN	56	11	52	10	59	13	40	16
BLOOMFIELD	56	11	52	10	N/A	N/A	9	3
GADSDEN	75	17	82	17	83	16	54	17
LAS CRUCES	56	11	37	8	43	10	12	4
LAS VEGAS CITY	32	4	19	2	42	9	30	12
LOS ALAMOS	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
LOS LUNAS	56	11	68	14	65	15	22	9
LOVINGTON	40	6	70	16	59	13	34	15
POJOAQUE	46	9	46	9	50	12	18	7
PORTALES	16	2	26	5	10	2	12	4
SANTA FE	56	11	19	2	18	3	15	6
SILVER CITY	71	16	63	13	43	10	30	12
SOCORRO	40	6	68	14	36	6	22	9
TAOS	48	10	52	10	25	5	27	11
TUCUMCARI	32	4	26	5	36	6	18	7
ANIMAS	54	17	37	15	12	9	49	11
CAPITAN	20	12	3	2	31	14	50	12
CARRIZOZO	7	5	35	14	5	4	3	2
CIMARRON	7	5	19	12	7	6	56	14
CLAYTON	21	13	14	8	9	7	5	3
CLOUDCROFT	85	19	19	12	6	5	12	5
CORONA	48	16	88	19	71	18	56	14
DES MOINES	16	10	9	4	31	14	64	17
DORA	2	2	11	5	65	17	64	17
ELIDA	3	3	52	17	1	1	61	16
EUNICE	15	9	37	15	71	18	50	12
GRADY	13	8	16	9	3	2	18	6
HOUSE	54	17	1	1	12	9	2	1
LOGAN	16	10	11	5	3	2	42	10
MELROSE	7	5	11	5	12	9	37	9
QUEMADO	21	13	63	18	15	12	26	8
RESERVE	4	4	6	3	25	13	8	4
ROY	37	15	16	9	10	8	18	6
SAN JON	1	1	18	11	36	16	64	17
BERNALILLO	75	10	80	11	78	11	69	10
CENTRAL CONS.	71	8	80	11	75	10	77	11
COBRE CONS.	56	4	70	7	71	9	61	7
DEMING	56	4	70	7	52	6	28	1
ESPANOLA	75	10	76	9	65	8	59	6
GALLUP	85	13	84	13	83	13	78	12
GRANTS-CIBOLA	71	8	52	4	52	6	40	3
LORDSBURG	46	1	46	3	43	4	64	8
MAGDALENA	80	12	6	1	31	2	64	8
QUESTA	56	4	37	2	19	1	79	13
SANTA ROSA	48	2	52	4	43	4	43	4
TULAROSA	48	2	63	6	78	11	54	5
VAUGHN	70	7	79	10	36	3	34	2

TABLE 10, CONTINUED

1992-93 ITBS/J AND 1991-92 ACT RANKINGS BY SCHOOL CLUSTER

	ITBS GRADE 3		ITBS GRADE 5		ITBS GRADE 8		ACT SCORES	
DISTRICT	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1992-93 STATE RANK	1992-93 CLUSTER RANK	1991-92 STATE RANK	1991-92 CLUSTER RANK
DEXTER	68	8	77	11	64	9	50	6
ESTANCIA	12	2	6	3	52	7	43	3
FLOYD	80	11	70	10	25	1	61	8
FT. SUMNER	21	3	25	4	25	1	46	4
HAGERMAN	75	9	63	8	78	10	69	9
JAL	21	3	35	6	45	5	46	4
LAKE ARTHUR	75	9	37	7	45	5	85	11
LOVING	40	7	63	8	35	3	79	10
MAXWELL	6	1	26	5	81	11	33	1
TATUM	21	3	5	2	52	7	50	6
TEXICO	21	3	3	1	43	4	37	2
CHAMA	66	11	52	8	59	6	69	6
CUBA	71	13	84	16	71	12	69	6
DULCE	84	16	52	8	85	16	87	17
HATCH	82	14	70	12	15	2	59	5
HONDO	48	7	37	4	59	6	75	10
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	82	14	87	18	75	13	82	13
JEMEZ VALLEY	48	7	52	8	36	3	75	10
LAS VEGAS WEST	56	9	70	12	82	15	79	12
MESA VISTA	16	3	26	2	65	9	86	16
MORA	37	5	77	14	65	9	34	1
MOSQUERO	11	2	26	2	7	1	84	15
MOUNTAINAIR	37	5	37	4	75	13	83	14
PECOS	66	11	46	6	65	9	56	4
PENASCO	21	4	46	6	50	4	46	3
RATON	56	9	52	8	52	5	43	2
SPRINGER	7	1	9	1	59	6	73	8
WAGON MOUND	85	17	84	16	86	17	73	8
ZUNI	88	18	83	15	87	18	88	18
ALAMOGORDO	21	2	26	3	24	3	6	2
AZTEC	13	1	19	2	19	2	37	10
CARLSBAD	32	5	26	3	43	7	16	5
CLOVIS	21	2	46	8	31	6	9	3
FARMINGTON	32	5	26	3	25	4	22	7
HOBBS	32	5	46	8	52	9	17	6
MORIARTY	21	2	14	1	15	1	4	1
ROSWELL	40	8	37	6	25	4	11	4
RUIDOSO	40	8	52	10	43	7	26	9
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	68	10	37	6	52	9	22	7

TABLE 11

HIGH SCHOOL COMPETENCY EXAMINATION: PERCENT OF GRADE 10 STUDENTS PASSING ALL SUBTESTS ON FIRST ATTEMPT

	1990-91		1991-92		1992-93	
DISTRICT	PERCENT	RANK	PERCENT	RANK	PERCENT	RANK
ALAMOGORDO	80.2%	23	82.3%	28	90.6%	25
ALBUQUERQUE	82.0%	17	82.7%	25	89.4%	28
ANIMAS	72.5%	53	87.5%	16	83.9%	48
ARTESIA	82.0%	17	78.8%	41	78.9%	66
AZTEC	79.3%	28	82.4%	26	88.4%	33
BELEN	70.0%	59	71.7%	61	77.8%	70
BERNALILLO	61.3%	76	51.0%	88	59.6%	86
BLOOMFIELD	79.0%	29	77.8%	44	84.0%	47
CAPITAN	81.8%	19	86.8%	17	86.2%	41
CARLSBAD	73.1%	49	73.0%	57	86.4%	39
CARRIZOZO	83.3%	16	94.4%	8	100.0%	1
CENTRAL	66.6%	68	62.4%	80	78.4%	68
CHAMA VALLEY	73.0%	50	70.0%	65	83.9%	48
CIMARRON	75.8%	42	93.8%	10	100.0%	1
CLAYTON	92.9%	9	68.8%	68	89.2%	29
CLOUDCROFT	93.1%	8	89.7%	14	94.7%	16
CLOVIS	72.1%	54	73.5%	55	82.7%	53
COBRE	70.2%	58	71.3%	63	81.9%	59
CORONA	100.0%	1	85.7%	18	100.0%	1
CUBA	62.9%	71	53.0%	86	58.5%	87
DEMING	76.6%	38	81.3%	30	86.3%	40
DES MOINES	75.0%	44	100.0%	1	90.0%	26
DEXTER	66.7%	66	64.4%	77	82.3%	57
DORA	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	88.2%	34
DULCE	56.8%	83	67.9%	69	80.0%	64
ELIDA	44.4%	87	100.0%	1	88.9%	30
ESPANOLA	61.2%	77	61.5%	81	71.9%	80
ESTANCIA	69.4%	62	73.6%	54	79.2%	65
EUNICE	80.3%	22	75.0%	50	88.9%	30
FARMINGTON	72.7%	51	80.1%	35	87.4%	36
FLOYD	60.0%	80	66.7%	71	90.9%	23
FT. SUMNER	73.7%	48	75.0%	50	90.9%	23
GADSDEN	62.3%	74	59.0%	83	67.1%	83
GALLUP	59.9%	81	63.1%	79	74.7%	74
GRADY	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
GRANTS-CIBOLA	61.8%	75	66.2%	73	78.3%	69
HAGERMAN	76.9%	36	82.4%	26	94.7%	16
HATCH	57.6%	82	57.3%	84	60.3%	85
HOBBS	70.8%	56	76.9%	47	82.2%	58
HONDO VALLEY	75.0%	44	81.3%	30	100.0%	1
HOUSE	80.0%	24	75.0%	50	100.0%	1
JAL	91.4%	10	82.9%	24	82.9%	52
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	77.4%	35	80.0%	36	94.7%	16
JEMEZ VALLEY	62.9%	71	59.6%	82	71.4%	81
LAKE ARTHUR	70.0%	59	94.4%	8	100.0%	1
LAS CRUCES	70.4%	57	72.0%	59	85.7%	42
LAS VEGAS CITY	76.0%	41	79.2%	39	91.8%	20
LAS VEGAS WEST	63.5%	69	73.0%	57	78.9%	66
LOGAN	93.3%	7	83.3%	21	83.3%	51
LORDSBURG	67.5%	64	79.5%	38	82.7%	53
LOS ALAMOS	96.6%	6	93.0%	12	97.0%	15
LOS LUNAS	69.7%	61	73.1%	56	87.5%	35
LOVING	84.0%	15	63.9%	78	73.0%	77
LOVINGTON	76.5%	39	67.7%	70	82.5%	55
MAGDALENA	45.0%	86	51.9%	87	47.1%	88

TABLE 11, CONTINUED

HIGH SCHOOL COMPETENCY EXAMINATION: PERCENT OF GRADE 10 STUDENTS PASSING ALL SUBTESTS ON FIRST ATTEMPT

	1990-91		1991-92		1992-93	
DISTRICT	PERCENT	RANK	PERCENT	RANK	PERCENT	RANK
MAXWELL	75.0%	44	77.8%	44	72.7%	78
MELROSE	90.5%	11	83.3%	21	94.7%	16
MESA VISTA	89.7%	12	71.0%	64	85.3%	44
MORA	60.4%	79	72.0%	59	81.0%	61
MORIARTY	88.7%	13	89.3%	15	97.7%	14
MOSQUERO	100.0%	1	83.3%	21	100.0%	1
MOUNTAINAIR	43.5%	88	74.1%	53	81.3%	60
PECOS	76.7%	37	65.9%	74	72.5%	79
PENASCO	79.7%	26	92.3%	13	77.4%	71
POJOAQUE	75.8%	42	80.7%	32	84.9%	45
PORTALES	77.9%	33	78.9%	40	81.0%	61
QUEMADO	81.8%	19	70.0%	65	100.0%	1
QUESTA	67.5%	64	70.0%	65	77.2%	72
RATON	68.9%	63	80.5%	33	83.6%	50
RESERVE	50.0%	84	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
ROSWELL	78.3%	32	78.5%	42	84.8%	46
ROY	80.0%	24	93.3%	11	88.9%	30
RUIDOSO	81.4%	21	77.1%	46	91.4%	22
SAN JON	66.7%	66	84.6%	19	100.0%	1
SANTA FE	79.5%	27	79.8%	37	85.4%	43
SANTA ROSA	60.9%	78	80.4%	34	90.0%	26
SILVER CITY	78.4%	31	76.4%	48	91.8%	20
SOCORRO	63.1%	70	65.3%	75	75.6%	73
SPRINGER	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
TAOS	74.0%	47	81.7%	29	80.4%	63
TATUM	77.8%	34	84.6%	19	87.0%	37
TEXICO	78.6%	30	75.9%	49	82.5%	55
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	84.1%	14	71.4%	62	74.4%	75
TUCUMCARI	76.3%	40	78.4%	43	87.0%	37
TULAROSA	70.9%	55	64.6%	76	69.8%	82
VAUGHN	62.5%	73	66.7%	71	100.0%	1
WAGON MOUND	72.7%	51	100.0%	1	66.7%	84
ZUNI	50.0%	84	54.6%	85	73.9%	76
STATEWIDE	74.9%		76.0%		84.1%	

FINANCIAL INDICATORS

State General Fund Appropriations

Since the inception of the state's public school funding formula, known as the State Equalization Guarantee, more than 90 percent of the total operational funding flowing to the 88 districts has come from state General Fund appropriations. Over the last three academic years, the actual amount of money appropriated for the schools has increased due to both enrollment growth and statutory changes, topping the one billion dollar mark for the first time in 1992-93. (See Figure 9.) During that same period of time, the schools share of the total General Fund appropriations decreased from 48.25 percent in 1990-91 to 47.30 percent in 1992-93. (See Figure 10.)

FIGURE 9

NEW MEXICO GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS

(In Millions)



	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
Higher/Other Education	$350.4	$361.4	$376.3
Public Schools	$928.9	$989.9	$1,022.8
Health & Human Services	$312.8	$342.7	$397.9
Legislative/Judicial/Gen. Govt.	$333.2	$350.9	$365.4

Source: "General Fund Financial Summary," DFA, 8/25/93.

FIGURE 10

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL & THE TOTAL APPROPRIATION
A COMPARISON FROM 1990-91 TO 1992-93
(In Millions)



Source: "General Fund Financial Summary," DFA, 8/25/93.

Average Teacher Salaries

Salaries reported for New Mexico teachers are the average returning teachers' salaries submitted by the districts at the beginning of the school years 1990-91 to 1992-93. During that time, the national average teacher's salary rose from $33,015 to $35,000 (6.01 percent), the regional from $27,781 to $29,312 (5.51 percent), and New Mexico's from $25,753 to $26,451 (2.71 percent). Based on its own salary data for 1992-93, the National Education Association ranked New Mexico 47th among all of the states and the District of Columbia. New Mexico's average returning teacher's salary for 1992-93 was $2,861 below the regional average and $8,549 below the national. (See Figure 11.) The region consists of the states of Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and New Mexico. Three year data by district for average returning teacher salary and district rankings are presented in Table 12.

Percent of Net Operating Budget Spent for Salaries

Table 13 shows the various percentages of districts' net operating budgets spent on salaries for certified teache.s, administration, support personnel, and non-certified staff. Because certain classifications may be paid through different line items at a district's discretion, pending State Department of Education approval, statewide percentages should be viewed with caution. In addition, small districts may appear to have a disproportionately high administrative cost resulting from the lower number of students enrolled.

Certified teachers include special education instructors (budget line items 1.141, 1.145, and 1.149). Administration is defined as superintendents and associates charged to the administration series except for clerical assistants

FIGURE 11

AVERAGE TEACHER SALARIES 1990-91 TO 1992-93



Sources: "Rankings of the States, 1993," NEA, 1993; "A First Look at New Mexico Public School Budgets," 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93 (in press).

(budget line items 3.110 and 3.120). Support personnel include instructional assistants, principals and their assistants, nurses, special education assistants, and so forth (budget line items 1.181, 1.185, 1.189, 2.110 to 2.170, 2.190, and 3.130). Non-certified personnel include maintenance and clerical/secretarial staff (budget line items 2.170 to 2.190, 3.130, 3.140, and 4.110 to 4.140). Note that expenditures for line items 2.170, 2.190, and 3.130—but no longer line items 1.181, 1.185, 1.189—may be split between the support and non-certified personnel categories.

Total Expenditures per Student and District Rankings

Net operational expenditures include those district costs that are most closely associated with the instructional process. These include expenditures for direct instruction, such as teachers' salaries and supplies and materials; for instructional support; for administration; for the maintenance and operation of the physical plant (buildings and grounds); and for fixed charges, such as employee fringe benefits and insurance. Because all districts have such costs in common, these expenditures on a per student basis constitute a stable measure for comparison of financial effort.

Total operational expenditures include net operational expenditures plus the costs incurred for food services; non-instructional student support, such as athletic salaries; community services, such as adult education and after school programs; transportation; operationally funded capital outlay; other operational expenses, such as out-of-state tuition and participation in regional center cooperatives; and operational emergencies. Districts are not equally faced with all of these costs; therefore, total operational expenditures per student are a somewhat less stable measure of comparison than net operational expenditures.

Table 14 provides both net operational and total operational expenditures per student for all districts as well as each district's statewide rankings.

Administrative Expenditures per Student and District Rankings

The percentage of each district's operational budget spent on a per student basis for costs listed as administrative by the districts in their budget reports is shown in Table 15. These costs include the salaries of the district superintendent and any administrative associates or aides, supplies and materials, and school board expenses. Please bear in mind that small districts will tend to have higher expenditures per student because of lower student enrollments.

Percent of Budget for Selected Programs

Table 16 indicates the percentage of each district's total operational and federal projects budget derived from Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Chapter I funding (both basic and migrant), ESEA Title VII Bilingual funding, and the United States Department of Agriculture Free and Reduced Lunch Program (free and reduced price breakfasts are not included). Also reported is the percentage of each district's total operational and federal projects budget made up of all federal project funding (the 17.000 line item series in the district budget reports) and the USDA Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Contributions from these combined sources range from a low of 1.45 percent in Los Alamos to a high of 41.90 percent in Mesa Vista.

Percent of Students Served by Selected Programs

Table 17 shows the percent of student membership served by Chapter I (basic and migrant), Title VII Bilingual Education, and state funded special education, as well as the percent of free and reduced price lunches served under the USDA's Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Other than state funded special education, these are federal programs supported by federal dollars.

State Special Education Revenue

The method by which New Mexico provides operational revenue to its school districts recognizes that the costs of providing an appropriate education for all students will vary according to individual student needs. Table 18 indicates the amount of money generated by special education students in each district and in the state as a whole. In addition, the percentage of the total operational expenditures represented by the allotted special education revenue is shown. However, because individual districts are responsible for establishing their own budgets, subject to state approval, the figures given in this table do not represent actual special education expenditures.

TABLE 12

AVERAGE RETURNING TEACHER SALARIES WITHOUT INCREMENTS FROM TENATIVE BUDGETS FOR SCHOOL YEARS 1990-91 TO 1992-93

DISTRICT	1990-91 SALARY	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 SALARY	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 SALARY	1992-93 RANK
ALAMOGORDO*	$25,418	46	$25,509	49	$25,659	49
ALBUQUERQUE*	$25,776	40	$26,893	20	$27,024	29
ANIMAS	$23,070	79	$24,293	75	$23,281	82
ARTESIA*	$27,797	10	$27,851	12	$27,862	16
AZTEC	$24,552	66	$24,674	62	$24,706	66
BELEN*	$24,732	61	$24,098	78	$24,449	69
BERNALILLO*	$24,981	55	$25,774	42	$27,213	28
BLOOMFIELD*	$26,086	33	$25,960	37	$25,111	57
CAPITAN*	$26,757	20	$26,827	22	$26,424	36
CARLSBAD	$26,371	29	$28,395	9	$29,957	9
CARRIZOZO	$25,918	36	$24,170	77	$24,329	74
CENTRAL *	$27,663	13	$28,372	10	$28,716	11
CHAMA VALLEY*	$24,116	71	$25,611	46	$25,778	45
CIMARRON	$26,707	22	$26,707	26	$27,568	22
CLAYTON*	$26,004	34	$25,626	45	$27,642	20
CLOUDCROFT*	$27,703	12	$27,753	14	$28,017	13
CLOVIS	$26,705	23	$26,396	29	$26,534	34
COBRE	$25,442	45	$24,625	64	$24,081	76
CORONA	$22,225	84	$21,861	84	$20,636	87
CUBA	$28,995	7	$30,361	4	$30,981	6
DEMING	$26,188	31	$25,804	40	$25,707	48
DES MOINES*	$21,727	87	$20,361	88	$22,904	85
DEXTER	$27,746	11	$28,469	8	$27,855	17
DORA	$25,750	41	$26,199	31	$27,011	30
DULCE*	$26,971	19	$27,605	16	$26,378	38
ELIDA	$20,787	88	$21,833	85	$21,965	86
ESPAÑOLA*	$24,912	57	$24,562	69	$24,705	67
ESTANCIA	$25,523	44	$25,231	55	$24,552	68
EUNICE*	$26,715	21	$25,755	43	$25,753	46
FARMINGTON*	$25,941	35	$26,120	34	$26,264	40
FLOYD	$22,445	82	$22,288	83	$23,420	80
FT. SUMNER*	$23,816	78	$24,186	76	$26,098	43
GADSDEN	$24,105	72	$24,620	65	$23,939	78
GALLUP*	$24,766	58	$24,783	60	$24,756	65
GRADY	$23,978	74	$24,979	57	$23,320	81
GRANTS-CIBOLA	$22,213	85	$24,326	74	$24,348	73
HAGERMAN*	$25,829	39	$26,036	36	$26,420	37
HATCH*	$29,239	6	$30,327	5	$29,514	10
HOBBS*	$26,471	27	$26,132	33	$26,262	41
HONDO VALLEY*	$23,909	77	$24,512	71	$24,777	64
HOUSE	$22,353	83	$21,117	86	$24,408	72
JAL*	$31,513	3	$32,019	2	$32,944	2
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN*	$25,255	52	$26,086	35	$28,004	14
JEMEZ VALLEY*	$24,546	67	$24,577	67	$24,891	62
LAKE ARTHUR	$24,743	60	$24,400	72	$25,087	58
LAS CRUCES*	$24,722	62	$25,385	50	$24,961	60
LAS VEGAS CITY*	$25,382	48	$25,152	56	$25,038	59
LAS VEGAS WEST	$25,134	53	$25,369	51	$25,745	47
LOGAN	$25,341	49	$25,284	53	$27,467	25
LORDSBURG	$24,604	64	$24,645	63	$25,169	56
LOS ALAMOS*	$30,701	4	$31,722	3	$36,981	1
LOS LUNAS*	$24,665	63	$24,875	59	$24,919	61
LOVING*	$25,283	50	$25,576	48	$30,064	8
LOVINGTON*	$28,781	8	$28,033	11	$27,378	27
MAGDALENA	$25,734	42	$25,239	54	$24,326	75
MAXWELL	$22,977	80	$24,337	73	$24,435	70

TABLE 12, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	1990-91 SALARY	1990-91 RANK	1991-92 SALARY	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 SALARY	1992-93 RANK
MELROSE	$26,481	26	$26,770	24	$26,659	32
MESA VISTA	$23,972	75	$25,911	39	$27,728	19
MORA	$26,344	30	$26,896	19	$30,669	7
MORIARTY*	$25,069	54	$24,545	70	$25,322	54
MOSQUERO	$22,205	86	$20,575	87	$20,553	88
MOUNTAINAIR*	$27,858	9	$27,471	17	$28,269	12
PECOS	$25,262	51	$26,305	30	$26,318	39
PEÑASCO	$27,550	14	$27,665	15	$27,825	18
POJOAQUE*	$26,422	28	$25,778	41	$25,967	44
PORTALES	$26,984	18	$26,733	25	$26,663	31
QUEMADO	$22,933	81	$22,877	82	$22,988	84
QUESTA	$24,123	70	$24,057	79	$23,899	79
RATON*	$27,502	16	$26,878	21	$26,496	35
RESERVE	$25,625	43	$25,649	44	$25,612	50
ROSWELL*	$26,667	24	$26,785	23	$27,965	15
ROY	$24,208	69	$25,360	52	$26,238	42
RUIDOSO	$30,412	5	$30,199	6	$31,088	5
SAN JON	$24,951	56	$24,004	80	$24,032	77
SANTA FE	$24,018	73	$24,711	61	$24,411	71
SANTA ROSA	$26,184	32	$26,676	27	$27,515	24
SILVER CITY	$27,115	17	$27,275	18	$27,417	26
SOCORRO*	$23,943	76	$24,607	66	$25,267	55
SPRINGER*	$26,578	25	$26,425	28	$27,567	23
TAOS*	$25,835	38	$26,189	32	$26,628	33
TATUM*	$32,582	2	$29,999	7	$32,007	4
TEXICO*	$32,788	1	$32,146	1	$32,850	3
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.*	$25,860	37	$25,594	47	$25,477	51
TUCUMCARI	$24,589	65	$24,565	68	$24,803	63
TULAROSA*	$25,392	47	$24,904	58	$25,456	52
VAUGHN*	$24,751	59	$23,957	81	$23,150	83
WAGON MOUND	$24,535	68	$25,914	38	$25,449	53
ZUNI	$27,519	15	$27,764	13	$27,588	21
STATEWIDE	$25,753		$26,242		$26,451	

NOTE: Average returning teachers' salaries shown in the table are those reported by the districts to the School Budget Planning Unit on form 925-B.

*Granted mid-year 1992-93 salary increases.

Sources: "A First Look at New Mexico Public School Budgets," 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 (in press).

TABLE 13
PERCENT OF 1992-93 NET OPERATING BUDGET SPENT FOR SALARIES

DISTRICT	TEACHERS	ADMINS.	SUPPORT PERSONNEL	NON-CERT. PERSONNEL
ALAMOGORDO	45.98%	0.77%	10.14%	10.33%
ALBUQUERQUE	46.91%	0.21%	13.06%	10.47%
ANIMAS	41.10%	2.70%	12.02%	9.44%
ARTESIA	50.41%	1.61%	9.94%	8.10%
AZTEC	49.17%	1.41%	11.42%	7.29%
BELEN	43.13%	1.59%	10.39%	8.54%
BERNALILLO	41.19%	0.97%	13.87%	9.90%
BLOOMFIELD	46.63%	0.87%	11.37%	8.86%
CAPITAN	44.23%	2.90%	11.55%	8.61%
CARLSBAD	51.09%	0.57%	10.72%	9.12%
CARRIZOZO	42.46%	4.14%	7.01%	11.44%
CENTRAL	47.13%	1.35%	9.62%	9.16%
CHAMA	38.38%	3.80%	7.52%	13.21%
CIMARRON	45.09%	2.51%	10.27%	9.02%
CLAYTON	44.83%	1.92%	11.38%	8.06%
CLOUDCROFT	45.58%	2.82%	8.06%	9.58%
CLOVIS	51.05%	0.93%	11.27%	8.50%
COBRE	43.36%	2.00%	11.43%	9.93%
CORONA	40.03%	7.58%	3.47%	9.38%
CUBA	42.78%	1.94%	8.41%	10.17%
DEMING	45.50%	1.52%	13.59%	8.30%
DES MOINES	46.57%	4.64%	3.13%	9.59%
DEXTER	44.34%	1.40%	12.20%	8.80%
DORA	44.37%	5.39%	5.35%	8.37%
DULCE	40.65%	3.08%	9.09%	11.21%
ELIDA	45.63%	8.58%	0.00%	6.84%
ESPAÑOLA	38.84%	1.01%	11.95%	10.30%
ESTANCIA	43.72%	1.95%	6.77%	9.00%
EUNICE	43.53%	2.28%	8.02%	11.43%
FARMINGTON	48.04%	1.21%	11.03%	7.45%
FLOYD	48.63%	4.42%	3.98%	7.87%
FT. SUMNER	43.09%	3.17%	9.23%	9.34%
GADSDEN	45.78%	0.71%	12.14%	8.96%
GALLUP-McKINLEY	44.20%	0.84%	9.88%	12.01%
GRADY	43.44%	5.82%	3.46%	8.93%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	41.00%	1.25%	8.77%	10.31%
HAGERMAN	41.40%	3.34%	10.42%	9.57%
HATCH	47.85%	1.33%	8.72%	7.60%
HOBBS	47.81%	0.76%	10.95%	9.43%
HONDO VALLEY	45.04%	5.93%	5.49%	9.21%
HOUSE*	44.33%	7.53%	5.46%	9.59%
JAL	50.09%	2.64%	7.42%	11.23%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	38.41%	3.18%	8.22%	10.78%
JEMEZ VALLEY	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
LAKE ARTHUR	44.02%	5.34%	3.67%	11.07%
LAS CRUCES	44.59%	0.44%	15.64%	7.94%
LAS VEGAS CITY	42.16%	1.33%	10.87%	11.03%
LAS VEGAS WEST	39.75%	2.29%	13.10%	10.33%
LOGAN	46.01%	3.92%	5.34%	9.65%
LORDSBURG	42.34%	1.87%	14.61%	7.74%
LOS ALAMOS	42.14%	1.37%	13.41%	12.58%
LOS LUNAS	41.77%	0.84%	11.28%	9.68%
LOVING	44.09%	4.36%	11.33%	8.13%
LOVINGTON	48.62%	1.74%	10.64%	7.98%
MAGDALENA	40.36%	3.12%	7.39%	12.44%
MAXWELL	47.13%	5.60%	2.02%	7.50%
MELROSE	44.86%	3.84%	7.38%	8.91%
MESA VISTA	37.86%	2.47%	8.45%	11.16%
MORA	41.99%	3.22%	8.70%	10.67%
MORIARTY	45.78%	1.48%	9.66%	8.03%
MOSQUERO	31.06%	6.94%	2.17%	9.45%
MOUNTAINAIR	43.99%	3.29%	10.36%	8.63%
PECOS**	39.84%	2.43%	12.86%	8.83%
PEÑASCO	40.68%	3.17%	10.11%	10.15%
POJOAQUE	42.58%	1.71%	12.63%	9.61%
PORTALES	47.81%	1.91%	10.06%	9.24%
QUEMADO	43.63%	5.09%	4.46%	12.32%
QUESTA	38.81%	3.41%	7.31%	11.03%
RATON	44.59%	1.09%	9.87%	7.65%
RESERVE	39.35%	3.75%	9.45%	10.31%
ROSWELL	48.73%	0.74%	12.82%	7.75%
ROY	44.34%	10.73%	1.84%	3.90%
RUIDOSO	49.73%	0.77%	9.62%	7.64%
SAN JON	47.30%	5.04%	1.07%	11.07%
SANTA FE	45.52%	0.83%	11.32%	8.77%
SANTA ROSA	41.43%	1.97%	10.94%	11.71%
SILVER CITY	49.79%	1.67%	11.16%	7.29%
SOCORRO	42.98%	2.14%	11.35%	8.60%
SPRINGER	36.78%	3.28%	10.97%	9.81%
TAOS	44.21%	1.91%	12.46%	10.13%
TATUM	48.69%	3.32%	6.64%	10.64%
TEXICO	51.11%	2.69%	9.35%	7.25%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	44.43%	1.13%	12.25%	8.56%
TUCUMCARI	44.10%	2.21%	9.52%	9.57%
TULAROSA	44.39%	2.49%	11.75%	8.93%
VAUGHN	44.50%	5.19%	4.09%	9.27%
WAGON MOUND	39.71%	5.62%	7.07%	9.80%
ZUNI	47.51%	1.80%	9.60%	9.74%
STATEWIDE	45.87%	0.98%	11.84%	9.59%

Note: Final expenditure figures, upon which these calculations are based, are subject to final verification by the SDE School Budget Planning Unit.

Sources: District Final Expenditure Reports, 1992-93; SDE District Accountability Survey, August 1993.

TABLE 14
NET[1] AND TOTAL[2] OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT WITH DISTRICT RANKINGS FOR 1990-91 TO 1992-93

DISTRICT	1992-93 FUNDED MEMBERSHIP[6]	1990-91 NET OP.	1990-91 RANK	1991-92[5] NET OP.	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 NET OP.	1992-93 RANK	1990-91 TOT. OP.	1990-91 RANK	1991-92[5] TOT. OP.	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 TOT. OP.	1992-93 RANK
ALAMOGORDO	7,664.0	$2,763	80	$2,807	80	$2,909	79	$3,032	83	$3,037	84	$3,143	83
ALBUQUERQUE	87,965.0	$3,276	51	$3,449	53	$3,414	52	$3,527	58	$3,699	57	$3,670	56
ANIMAS	542.5	$2,974	65	$3,580	46	$3,432	51	$3,884	50	$4,732	33	$4,259	43
ARTESIA	3,760.5	$2,685	83	$2,701	87	$2,802	84	$3,097	79	$3,130	80	$3,333	73
AZTEC	3,083.5	$2,777	79	$2,757	83	$2,864	81	$3,129	75	$3,118	83	$3,161	81
BELEN	4,242.0	$2,974	65	$2,841	78	$3,045	66	$3,335	66	$3,150	77	$3,370	70
BERNALILLO	3,286.0	$3,240	55	$3,296	56	$3,367	53	$3,543	57	$3,600	58	$3,636	57
BLOOMFIELD	3,607.0	$2,872	73	$2,938	69	$2,961	75	$3,282	69	$3,332	68	$3,299	75
CAPITAN	535.0	$3,723	39	$3,559	48	$3,531	50	$4,505	34	$4,287	45	$4,242	44
CARLSBAD	7,042.0	$2,735	82	$2,850	77	$2,957	76	$3,033	82	$3,129	81	$3,222	77
CARRIZOZO	228.5	$4,528	16	$4,142	25	$4,741	13	$5,359	23	$4,948	28	$5,615	17
CENTRAL	6,961.0	$2,912	69	$2,912	72	$3,002	71	$3,326	67	$3,317	69	$3,342	72
CHAMA VALLEY	559.0	$4,060	27	$4,347	16	$4,507	18	$4,753	29	$4,949	27	$5,230	25
CIMARRON	545.5	$4,307	21	$4,308	18	$4,088	28	$5,047	27	$5,020	24	$4,794	31
CLAYTON	744.5	$4,073	26	$4,105	26	$4,075	29	$5,259	24	$5,298	21	$5,592	18
CLOUDCROFT	499.0	$3,867	32	$3,775	35	$3,866	33	$4,490	35	$4,588	35	$4,594	33
CLOVIS	8,903.5	$2,753	81	$2,718	84	$2,788	85	$3,064	80	$2,977	87	$3,023	87
COBRE	1,971.0	$2,994	63	$2,855	76	$3,026	67	$3,435	62	$3,252	72	$3,448	68
CORONA	85.0	$5,491	4	$5,376	4	$5,900	3	$7,559	3	$7,245	3	$8,157	2
CUBA	710.5	$4,211	22	$4,288	21	$4,233	25	$5,523	17	$5,493	15	$5,539	19
DEMING	4,758.5	$2,672	84	$2,718	84	$2,934	77	$2,992	84	$2,996	86	$3,239	76
DES MOINES	152.5	$4,338	20	$4,673	10	$5,141	8	$6,011	8	$6,653	5	$6,922	5
DEXTER	962.5	$3,567	45	$3,770	37	$3,817	36	$4,261	44	$4,365	41	$4,288	42
DORA	249.0	$4,370	19	$3,652	42	$3,573	45	$5,655	14	$4,814	30	$5,179	26
DULCE	571.5	$3,912	30	$4,166	24	$4,234	24	$4,294	41	$4,489	37	$4,427	37
ELIDA	140.5	$4,016	28	$4,355	15	$4,731	14	$5,916	10	$6,338	7	$6,490	6
ESPAÑOLA	5,128.5	$3,266	52	$3,302	55	$3,357	54	$3,617	56	$3,708	55	$3,764	53
ESTANCIA	682.5	$3,401	49	$3,541	49	$3,577	44	$4,012	47	$4,215	46	$4,418	39
EUNICE	818.0	$2,974	65	$3,094	61	$3,266	59	$3,177	73	$3,355	67	$3,467	66
FARMINGTON	9,632.5	$2,802	77	$2,767	82	$2,837	83	$3,058	81	$3,024	85	$3,083	85
FLOYD	207.5	$5,967	2	$4,835	9	$4,050	30	$7,719	2	$5,920	9	$4,874	29
FT. SUMNER	395.5	$3,768	37	$3,661	41	$3,856	34	$4,815	28	$4,769	32	$4,955	28
GADSDEN	10,516.0	$2,544	86	$2,715	86	$2,763	86	$2,879	85	$3,131	79	$3,137	84
GALLUP	13,002.5	$2,861	74	$2,860	75	$2,964	74	$3,199	72	$3,215	74	$3,349	71
GRADY	152.0	$5,258	5	$4,591	11	$4,640	15	$6,749	5	$5,881	10	$5,902	9
GRANTS-CIBOLA	3,804.5	$2,953	68	$3,080	63	$3,005	70	$3,307	68	$3,461	64	$3,394	69
HAGERMAN	421.0	$3,540	46	$3,844	33	$3,657	41	$4,190	45	$4,413	40	$4,172	46
HATCH	1,296.0	$3,202	56	$3,094	61	$3,165	63	$3,727	52	$3,837	53	$3,748	54
HOBBS	8,380.5	$2,634	85	$2,611	88	$2,745	87	$2,871	86	$2,843	88	$3,051	86
HONDO VALLEY	159.5	$4,892	10	$4,308	18	$4,758	12	$5,700	12	$5,085	23	$5,706	14
HOUSE	80.5	$6,067	1	$5,180	6	$6,061	2	$7,867	1	$6,936	4	$8,027	3
JAL	552.0	$3,675	41	$3,628	45	$3,646	43	$3,929	48	$3,895	51	$3,938	49
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	456.0	$4,141	24	$4,305	20	$4,274	22	$5,459	20	$5,549	14	$5,438	21
JEMEZ VALLEY	1,452.5	$3,666	42	$3,729	39	N.A.		$4,265	43	$4,157	47	N.A.	
LAKE ARTHUR	198.5	$4,539	15	$4,508	13	$4,148	27	$5,187	25	$5,342	17	$4,613	32
LAS CRUCES	20,173.5	$2,978	64	$3,014	66	$3,019	68	$3,260	70	$3,296	70	$3,329	74
LAS VEGAS CITY	2,741.0	$3,254	54	$3,225	58	$3,314	56	$3,622	55	$3,584	59	$3,617	60
LAS VEGAS WEST	2,050.0	N.A.		$3,631	44	$3,533	49	N.A.		$4,108	49	$3,915	51
LOGAN	290.5	$4,115	25	$3,747	38	$4,266	23	$5,481	18	$4,976	25	$5,666	16
LORDSBURG	795.5	$3,604	44	$3,526	50	$3,762	40	$4,370	37	$4,310	44	$4,458	36

TABLE 14, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	1992-93 FUNDED MEMBERSHIP[3]	1990-91 NET OP.	1990-91 RANK	1991-92[4] NET OP.	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 NET OP.	1992-93 RANK	1990-91 TOT. OP.	1990-91 RANK	1991-92[4] TOT. OP.	1991-92 RANK	1992-93 TOT. OP.	1992-93 RANK
LOS ALAMOS	3,438.5	$5,044	8	$5,228	5	$5,457	6	$5,478	19	$5,658	12	$5,868	10
LOS LUNAS	6,091.5	$2,790	78	$2,804	81	$2,993	73	$3,105	78	$3,157	76	$3,452	67
LOVING	496.5	$3,706	40	$3,679	40	$3,769	39	$4,142	46	$4,328	42	$4,174	45
LOVINGTON	3,113.0	$2,908	70	$2,900	73	$2,841	82	$3,217	71	$3,293	71	$3,190	79
MAGDALENA	344.5	$4,381	18	$4,010	30	$4,216	26	$5,052	26	$4,804	31	$4,997	27
MAXWELL	124.0	$4,993	9	$5,589	3	$5,470	5	$5,760	11	$6,355	6	$6,098	8
MELROSE	270.5	$4,382	17	$4,280	22	$4,385	19	$5,418	22	$5,260	22	$5,355	22
MESA VISTA	518.0	$4,148	23	$4,346	17	$4,618	16	$5,586	16	$5,325	18	$5,493	20
MORA	702.5	$3,759	38	$3,813	34	$3,833	35	$4,437	36	$4,526	36	$4,541	34
MORIARTY	3,257.5	$2,907	71	$2,879	74	$3,006	69	$3,502	59	$3,480	62	$3,576	61
MOSQUERO	48.5	$5,930	3	$7,416	1	$9,973	1	$7,552	4	$9,413	1	$12,139	1
MOUNTAINAIR	410.0	$3,906	31	$4,059	29	$4,044	31	$4,672	32	$4,848	29	$4,804	30
PECOS	805.0	$3,770	36	$3,774	36	$3,573	45	$4,268	42	$4,437	39	$4,016	48
PEÑASCO	767.0	$3,523	47	$3,477	52	$3,573	45	$4,304	40	$4,017	50	$4,114	47
POJOAQUE	1,823.0	$3,138	57	$3,261	57	$3,189	61	$3,658	53	$3,706	56	$3,622	58
PORTALES	2,991.0	$2,811	76	$2,828	79	$2,872	80	$3,162	74	$3,121	82	$3,148	82
QUEMADO	184.5	$4,841	13	$4,429	14	$4,784	11	$6,405	7	$5,955	8	$6,483	7
QUESTA	720.0	N.A.		$3,934	31	$3,809	37	N.A.		$4,591	34	$4,427	37
RATON	1,560.0	$3,266	52	$2,995	67	$3,306	57	$3,642	54	$3,403	65	$3,682	55
RESERVE	272.5	$3,859	33	$4,244	23	$4,599	17	$4,712	31	$5,307	20	$5,669	15
ROSWELL	10,745.5	$2,882	72	$2,921	71	$2,996	72	$3,111	77	$3,149	78	$3,202	78
ROY	106.5	$5,223	6	$5,772	2	$5,614	4	$6,654	6	$7,389	2	$7,036	4
RUIDOSO	2,120.0	$3,277	50	$3,309	54	$3,345	55	$3,748	51	$3,798	54	$3,906	52
SAN JON	199.0	$3,799	34	$4,064	28	$4,287	21	$4,731	30	$5,321	19	$5,267	23
SANTA FE	12,348.0	$2,861	74	$2,957	68	$2,917	78	$3,123	76	$3,210	75	$3,187	80
SANTA ROSA	870.0	$3,616	43	$3,580	46	$3,648	42	$4,360	38	$4,324	43	$4,304	41
SILVER CITY	3,964.5	$3,098	59	$3,146	60	$3,205	60	$3,425	63	$3,472	63	$3,524	64
SOCORRO	2,036.0	$3,039	60	$3,034	65	$3,187	62	$3,366	65	$3,387	66	$3,488	65
SPRINGER	295.5	$4,868	12	$4,902	8	$4,958	9	$5,684	13	$5,672	11	$5,740	13
TAOS	3,116.0	$3,108	58	$3,176	59	$3,272	58	$3,476	60	$3,547	61	$3,618	59
TATUM	351.5	$4,554	14	$4,083	27	$4,384	20	$5,446	21	$4,967	26	$5,253	24
TEXICO	515.0	$3,924	29	$3,876	32	$3,950	32	$4,560	33	$4,484	38	$4,526	35
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	1,584.0	$2,997	62	$3,059	64	$3,100	65	$3,467	61	$3,551	60	$3,529	63
TUCUMCARI	1,621.5	$3,001	61	$2,931	70	$3,145	64	$3,401	64	$3,234	73	$3,544	62
TULAROSA	1,066.5	$3,797	35	$3,634	43	$3,780	38	$4,321	39	$4,140	48	$4,323	40
VAUGHN	170.0	$5,066	7	$5,022	7	$5,163	7	$5,626	15	$5,585	13	$5,795	11
WAGON MOUND	171.0	$4,892	10	$4,539	12	$4,884	10	$5,997	9	$5,449	16	$5,766	12
ZUNI	1,570.5	$3,506	48	$3,487	51	$3,562	48	$3,888	49	$3,880	52	$3,919	50
STATEWIDE	303,945.0	$3,099		$3,173		$3,195		$3,437		$3,512		$3,533	

Note: Final expenditure figures upon which these calculations are based are subject to final verification by the SDE School Budget Planning Unit.

[1]Net operational expenditures include those for direct instruction, instructional support, administration, operation and maintenance of plant, and fixed charges, such as fringe benefits and insurance.

[2]Total operational expenditures include net operational expenditures plus those for food services, non-instructional student support, community services, pupil transportation services, operationally funded capital outlay (most capital outlay projects are funded by other means), other operational costs, and operational emergencies.

[3]Funded membership consists of the total number of students in grades one through twelve and in C-level, D-level, and D-level non-profit (private) special education programs; because districts are funded on a half-day basis for early childhood programs, the full-time equivalency number of students in such programs is used in these computations.

[4]Calculations do not include instructional materials credits.

Sources: Final Funded Membership Report, 1992-93; District Final Expenditure Reports, 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93

TABLE 15
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER STUDENT WITH DISTRICT RANKINGS FOR 1990-91 TO 1992-93

DISTRICT	1992-93 FUNDED MEMBERSHIP[1]	1990-91 ADMIN. COST	1990-91 RANK	1990-91 % ADMIN.[2]	1991-92 ADMIN. COST[2]	1991-92 RANK	1991-92 % ADMIN.[3]	1992-93 ADMIN. COST	1992-93 RANK	1992-93 % ADMIN.[3]
ALAMOGORDO	7,664.0	$103	68	3.41%	$108	69	3.54%	$113	67	4.00%
ALBUQUERQUE	87,965.0	$54	86	1.53%	$53	88	1.45%	$52	87	1.00%
ANIMAS	542.5	$244	37	6.27%	$278	34	5.88%	$274	33	6.00%
ARTESIA	3,760.5	$95	71	3.08%	$96	73	3.06%	$102	69	3.00%
AZTEC	3,083.5	$88	75	2.82%	$83	80	2.65%	$86	79	3.00%
BELEN	4,242.0	$117	64	3.51%	$110	68	3.50%	$161	53	5.00%
BERNALILLO	3,286.0	$186	46	5.25%	$144	59	4.00%	$128	63	4.00%
BLOOMFIELD	3,607.0	$96	70	2.93%	$90	75	2.69%	$89	75	3.00%
CAPITAN	535.0	$251	36	5.56%	$260	36	6.06%	$253	35	6.00%
CARLSBAD	7,042.0	$103	68	3.40%	$78	83	2.50%	$60	86	2.00%
CARRIZOZO	228.5	$411	14	7.68%	$402	15	8.13%	$441	14	8.00%
CENTRAL	6,961.0	$87	76	2.62%	$90	75	2.71%	$89	75	3.00%
CHAMA VALLEY	559.0	$392	15	8.25%	$384	16	7.77%	$417	16	8.00%
CIMARRON	545.5	$274	32	5.43%	$257	37	5.12%	$228	38	5.00%
CLAYTON	744.5	$203	45	3.85%	$212	45	4.01%	$189	47	3.00%
CLOUDCROFT	499.0	$276	31	6.14%	$255	38	5.55%	$277	32	6.00%
CLOVIS	8,903.5	$75	83	2.45%	$77	85	2.57%	$75	84	2.00%
COBRE	1,971.0	$140	56	4.07%	$123	63	3.79%	$143	59	4.00%
CORONA	85.0	$704	3	9.31%	$704	4	9.72%	$811	2	10.00%
CUBA	710.5	$236	38	4.27%	$207	46	3.78%	$219	41	4.00%
DEMING	4,758.5	$109	65	3.65%	$105	70	3.51%	$107	68	3.00%
DES MOINES	152.5	$374	17	6.23%	$382	18	5.74%	$483	10	7.00%
DEXTER	962.5	$140	56	3.28%	$146	57	3.34%	$147	58	3.00%
DORA	249.0	$357	20	6.31%	$313	27	6.50%	$285	31	6.00%
DULCE	571.5	$252	35	5.87%	$342	24	7.61%	$334	27	8.00%
ELIDA	140.5	$433	13	7.32%	$491	6	7.74%	$474	11	7.00%
ESPAÑOLA	5,128.5	$143	55	3.96%	$143	60	3.87%	$157	55	4.00%
ESTANCIA	682.5	$175	49	4.36%	$178	50	4.21%	$183	49	4.00%
EUNICE	818.0	$165	53	5.20%	$168	51	5.01%	$169	50	5.00%
FARMINGTON	9,632.5	$104	67	3.39%	$85	78	2.81%	$82	81	3.00%
FLOYD	207.5	$579	4	7.50%	$471	9	7.96%	$339	25	7.00%
FT. SUMNER	395.5	$220	43	4.58%	$217	42	4.54%	$229	37	5.00%
GADSDEN	10,516.0	$73	84	2.53%	$78	83	2.48%	$74	85	2.00%
GALLUP	13,002.5	$82	81	2.57%	$82	81	2.54%	$90	74	3.00%
GRADY	152.0	$542	6	8.02%	$458	11	7.79%	$449	13	8.00%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	3,804.5	$128	62	3.88%	$146	57	4.21%	$141	60	4.00%
HAGERMAN	421.0	$271	33	6.46%	$247	39	5.60%	$226	39	5.00%
HATCH	1,296.0	$138	59	3.69%	$117	65	3.06%	$124	64	3.00%
HOBBS	8,380.5	$71	85	2.47%	$75	87	2.65%	$81	82	3.00%
HONDO VALLEY	159.5	$470	12	8.24%	$424	13	8.34%	$511	8	9.00%
HOUSE	80.5	$845	2	10.75%	$710	2	10.24%	$806	4	10.00%
JAL	552.0	$173	50	4.40%	$182	49	4.66%	$191	46	5.00%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	456.0	$381	16	6.99%	$383	17	6.90%	$377	20	7.00%
JEMEZ VALLEY	1,452.5	$226	41	5.29%	$293	30	7.06%	N.A.		
LAKE ARTHUR	198.5	$499	8	9.62%	$445	12	8.32%	$466	12	10.00%
LAS CRUCES	20,173.5	$77	82	2.36%	$76	86	2.31%	$76	83	2.00%
LAS VEGAS CITY	2,741.0	$140	56	3.86%	$129	61	3.60%	$138	62	4.00%
LAS VEGAS WEST	2,050.0	N.A.			$199	47	4.83%	$165	51	4.00%
LOGAN	290.5	$369	18	6.73%	$357	21	7.17%	$381	19	7.00%
LORDSBURG	795.5	$171	51	3.91%	$167	52	3.88%	$184	48	4.00%

TABLE 15, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	1992-93 FUNDED MEMBERSHIP[1]	1990-91 ADMIN. COST	1990-91 RANK	1990-91 % ADMIN.[2]	1991-92 ADMIN. COST[2]	1991-92 RANK	1991-92 % ADMIN.[2]	1992-93 ADMIN. COST	1992-93 RANK	1992-93[2] % ADMIN.[2]
LOS ALAMOS	3,438.5	$217	44	3.97%	$217	42	3.83%	$215	42	4.00%
LOS LUNAS	6,091.5	$95	71	3.05%	$97	71	3.08%	$95	72	3.00%
LOVING	496.5	$226	41	5.47%	$215	44	4.98%	$225	40	5.00%
LOVINGTON	3,113.0	$91	73	2.84%	$86	77	2.61%	$86	79	3.00%
MAGDALENA	344.5	$339	22	6.71%	$350	23	7.28%	$375	21	8.00%
MAXWELL	124.0	$477	10	8.29%	$479	7	7.54%	$564	6	9.00%
MELROSE	270.5	$315	25	5.81%	$338	26	6.42%	$308	28	6.00%
MESA VISTA	518.0	$324	23	5.80%	$356	22	6.68%	$431	15	8.00%
MORA	702.5	$287	28	6.47%	$291	31	6.43%	$349	24	8.00%
MORIARTY	3,257.5	$86	77	2.45%	$115	66	3.32%	$96	70	3.00%
MOSQUERO	48.5	$1,027	1	13.60%	$1,270	1	13.49%	$1,680	1	14.00%
MOUNTAINAIR	410.0	$291	27	6.23%	$299	28	6.16%	$336	26	7.00%
PECOS	805.0	$286	29	6.70%	$296	29	6.67%	$258	34	6.00%
PEÑASCO	767.0	$277	30	6.44%	$283	32	7.04%	$299	29	7.00%
POJOAQUE	1,823.0	$179	48	4.90%	$153	54	4.14%	$151	57	4.00%
PORTALES	2,991.0	$120	63	3.78%	$122	64	3.92%	$118	65	4.00%
QUEMADO	184.5	$478	9	7.46%	$461	10	7.75%	$492	9	8.00%
QUESTA	720.0	N.A.			$418	14	9.11%	$361	22	8.00%
RATON	1,560.0	$86	77	2.37%	$81	82	2.38%	$91	73	2.00%
RESERVE	272.5	$324	23	6.89%	$365	20	6.88%	$402	17	7.00%
ROSWELL	10,745.5	$85	79	2.74%	$84	79	2.68%	$87	78	3.00%
ROY	106.5	$561	5	8.43%	$708	3	9.58%	$811	2	12.00%
RUIDOSO	2,120.0	$90	74	2.40%	$97	71	2.56%	$96	70	2.00%
SAN JON	199.0	$357	20	7.54%	$375	19	7.04%	$384	18	7.00%
SANTA FE	12,348.0	$83	80	2.66%	$93	74	2.91%	$88	77	3.00%
SANTA ROSA	870.0	$264	34	6.06%	$264	35	6.12%	$214	43	5.00%
SILVER CITY	3,964.5	$106	66	3.10%	$112	67	3.22%	$116	66	3.00%
SOCORRO	2,036.0	$130	61	3.88%	$126	62	3.71%	$163	52	5.00%
SPRINGER	295.5	$363	19	6.38%	$339	25	5.97%	$355	23	6.00%
TAOS	3,116.0	$167	52	4.82%	$160	53	4.51%	$159	54	4.00%
TATUM	351.5	$298	26	5.47%	$279	33	5.61%	$298	30	6.00%
TEXICO	515.0	$234	39	5.12%	$230	41	5.13%	$212	44	5.00%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	1,584.0	$131	60	3.79%	$149	56	4.20%	$139	61	4.00%
TUCUMCARI	1,621.5	$155	54	4.57%	$150	55	4.65%	$155	56	4.00%
TULAROSA	1,066.5	$234	39	5.41%	$238	40	5.75%	$236	36	5.00%
VAUGHN	170.0	$507	7	9.00%	$514	5	9.21%	$609	5	11.00%
WAGON MOUND	171.0	$473	11	7.89%	$472	8	8.66%	$564	6	10.00%
ZUNI	1,570.5	$183	47	4.70%	$192	48	4.95%	$201	45	5.00%
STATE TOTALS	303,945.0	$100			$101		2.87%	$100		3.00%

Note: Final expenditure figures upon which these calculations are based are subject to final verification by the SDE School Budget Planning Unit.

[1]Funded membership consists of the total number of students in grades one through twelve and in C-level, D-level, and D-level non-profit (private) special education programs; because districts are funded on a half-day basis for early childhood programs, the full-time equivalency number of students in such programs is used in these computations.

[2]Calculations do not include instructional materials credits.

[3]The percent of the total operational budget represented by the administration line items (3.000 series).

Sources: Final Funded Membership Report, 1992-93; District Final Expenditure Reports, 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93.

TABLE 16
SELECTED FEDERAL PROGRAMS AS A PERCENTAGE OF 1992-93 DISTRICT TOTAL OPERATIONAL, FEDERAL PROJECT, AND USDA FREE AND REDUCED LUNCH PROGRAM FUNDING

DISTRICT	ESEA CHAPTER I (BASIC & MIGRANT)	PERCENT	ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL	PERCENT	USDA FREE & REDUCED LUNCH[1]	PERCENT	% ALL FED. PROJS.[2] & USDA LUNCH
ALAMOGORDO	$961,483.39	3.68%	$0.00	0.00%	$509,457.54	1.95%	7.82%
ALBUQUERQUE	$9,693,884.51	2.80%	$721,389.49	0.21%	$6,040,031.46	1.74%	6.89%
ANIMAS	$19,179.75	0.78%	$0.00	0.00%	$42,157.35	1.71%	6.46%
ARTESIA	$417,703.64	3.06%	$125,741.92	0.92%	$249,270.81	1.83%	8.04%
AZTEC	$295,239.58	2.82%	$0.00	0.00%	$201,723.27	1.92%	7.02%
BELEN	$482,568.31	3.08%	$170,000.00	1.09%	$400,080.65	2.56%	8.61%
BERNALILLO	$811,928.71	5.58%	$151,904.22	1.04%	$398,319.63	2.74%	17.96%
BLOOMFIELD	$469,309.86	3.44%	$0.00	0.00%	$285;493.79	2.09%	12.81%
CAPITAN	$104,507.58	4.01%	$0.00	0.00%	$39,324.82	1.51%	12.83%
CARLSBAD	$887,271.57	3.53%	$0.00	0.00%	$574,250.94	2.28%	9.87%
CARRIZOZO	$93,779.45	6.31%	$0.00	0.00%	$20,217.59	1.36%	13.62%
CENTRAL	$2,126,313.69	7.05%	$134,493.30	0.45%	$977,836.03	3.24%	22.90%
CHAMA VALLEY	$155,686.14	4.76%	$0.00	0.00%	$87,811.27	2.68%	10.64%
CIMARRON	$49,956.28	1.76%	$0.00	0.00%	$37,912.14	1.33%	8.11%
CLAYTON	$168,591.68	3.72%	$0.00	0.00%	$70,618.95	1.56%	8.17%
CLOUDCROFT	$7,627.41	0.32%	$0.00	0.00%	$25,214.74	1.04%	5.29%
CLOVIS	$1,261,470.92	4.26%	$0.00	0.00%	$868,967.44	2.93%	9.12%
COBRE	$377,355.69	5.02%	$0.00	0.00%	$226,912.15	3.02%	9.61%
CORONA	$11,177.44	1.46%	$0.00	0.00%	$6,334.26	0.83%	9.19%
CUBA	$68,646.24	1.50%	$81,008.77	1.77%	$109,965.43	2.40%	14.06%
DEMING	$837,343.40	4.86%	$179,467.31	1.04%	$536,692.19	3.12%	10.55%
DES MOINES	$22,284.98	1.97%	$0.00	0.00%	$11,033.41	0.98%	6.65%
DEXTER	$189,785.23	3.99%	$156,632.71	3.29%	$132,193.91	2.78%	13.26%
DORA	$29,262.87	2.11%	$0.00	0.00%	$19,895.31	1.43%	7.02%
DULCE	$56,569.50	1.77%	$0.00	0.00%	$84,432.96	2.64%	20.89%
ELIDA	$9,044.09	0.95%	$0.00	0.00%	$17,187.49	1.80%	4.47%
ESPAÑOLA	$1,335,176.10	6.07%	$241,988.26	1.10%	$541,500.21	2.46%	12.23%
ESTANCIA	$125,533.88	3.85%	$0.00	0.00%	$81,222.43	2.49%	7.57%
EUNICE	$36,289.52	1.21%	$0.00	0.00%	$56,561.49	1.89%	5.27%
FARMINGTON	$539,323.95	1.69%	$0.00	0.00%	$553,259.57	1.73%	6.90%
FLOYD	$22,229.59	1.99%	$0.00	0.00%	$24,376.53	2.18%	9.54%
FT. SUMNER	$83,115.88	3.81%	$0.00	0.00%	$37,912.12	1.74%	10.10%
GADSDEN	$1,929,852.81	5.13%	$236,469.44	0.63%	$1,860,510.30	4.94%	12.36%
GALLUP	$4,376,560.84	7.90%	$0.00	0.00%	$1,610,931.83	2.91%	21.40%
GRADY	$18,895.79	2.00%	$0.00	0.00%	$8,084.20	0.86%	4.89%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	$984,245.92	6.59%	$0.00	0.00%	$388,298.55	2.60%	13.51%
HAGERMAN	$110,307.49	5.45%	$0.00	0.00%	$54,327.22	2.68%	13.27%
HATCH	$498,255.18	8.73%	$0.00	0.00%	$194,227.73	3.40%	14.91%
HOBBS	$680,843.67	2.51%	$0.00	0.00%	$632,216.12	2.33%	5.85%
HONDO VALLEY	$86,512.55	8.05%	$0.00	0.00%	$24,163.79	2.25%	15.32%
HOUSE	$29,273.77	4.13%	$0.00	0.00%	$8,260.84	1.17%	8.84%
JAL	$27,821.00	1.20%	$0.00	0.00%	$48,927.23	2.11%	6.45%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	$160,029.51	5.26%	$241,821.32	7.95%	$65,356.90	2.15%	18.45%
JEMEZ VALLEY	N.A.		N.A.		$105,243.20		
LAKE ARTHUR	$60,000.42	5.70%	$0.00	0.00%	$29,645.62	2.82%	12.97%
LAS CRUCES	$2,475,244.09	3.36%	$136,103.03	0.18%	$1,992,407.58	2.70%	8.88%
LAS VEGAS CITY	$424,119.98	3.87%	$0.00	0.00%	$284,692.89	2.60%	9.61%
LAS VEGAS WEST	$631,586.27	6.24%	$224,947.98	2.22%	$272,686.18	2.69%	20.67%

TABLE 16, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	ESEA CHAPTER I (BASIC & MIGRANT)	PERCENT	ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL	PERCENT	USDA FREE & REDUCED LUNCH[1]	PERCENT	% ALL FED. PROJS.[2] & USDA LUNCH
LOGAN	$42,125.00	2.41%	$0.00	0.00%	$18,086.70	1.03%	5.98%
LORDSBURG	$206,180.81	5.16%	$0.00	0.00%	$86,309.80	2.16%	11.26%
LOS ALAMOS	$81,088.48	0.40%	$0.00	0.00%	$2,874.66	0.01%	1.45%
LOS LUNAS	$364,297.31	1.61%	$123,719.70	0.55%	$545,947.36	2.42%	6.91%
LOVING	$97,342.39	3.99%	$0.00	0.00%	$78,499.67	3.22%	15.02%
LOVINGTON	$638,731.50	5.83%	$0.00	0.00%	$224,597.20	2.05%	9.39%
MAGDALENA	$237,703.59	10.34%	$79,670.79	3.47%	$44,891.84	1.95%	25.12%
MAXWELL	$37,018.58	4.35%	$0.00	0.00%	$10,570.90	1.24%	11.06%
MELROSE	$34,005.02	2.18%	$0.00	0.00%	$23,880.20	1.53%	7.07%
MESA VISTA	$194,609.72	3.97%	$390,639.27	7.98%	$74,586.51	1.52%	41.90%
MORA	$257,983.35	6.83%	$0.00	0.00%	$124,334.89	3.29%	15.49%
MORIARTY	$110,536.77	0.91%	$0.00	0.00%	$170,369.94	1.40%	4.30%
MOSQUERO	$13,940.78	2.22%	$0.00	0.00%	$4,617.63	0.74%	6.22%
MOUNTAINAIR	$168,452.08	7.42%	$0.00	0.00%	$49,986.24	2.20%	13.29%
PECOS	$169,244.08	4.40%	$154,495.20	4.01%	$103,597.76	2.69%	16.03%
PEÑASCO	$269,399.37	6.85%	$312,607.78	7.94%	$107,975.53	2.74%	19.82%
POJOAQUE	$113,802.00	1.56%	$126,516.97	1.73%	$125,295.18	1.72%	9.56%
PORTALES	$641,176.35	5.41%	$0.00	0.00%	$276,257.11	2.33%	20.61%
QUEMADO	$31,040.19	2.41%	$0.00	0.00%	$17,742.34	1.38%	7.04%
QUESTA	$54,648.59	1.51%	$158,168.79	4.38%	$107,800.53	2.98%	11.76%
RATON	$242,978.56	3.89%	$0.00	0.00%	$102,569.32	1.64%	8.00%
RESERVE	$78,831.90	4.66%	$0.00	0.00%	$25,152.45	1.49%	8.75%
ROSWELL	$1,690,959.03	4.49%	$101,481.02	0.27%	$810,723.74	2.15%	8.57%
ROY	$6,182.00	0.78%	$0.00	0.00%	$7,345.20	0.92%	6.01%
RUIDOSO	$79,813.98	0.87%	$124,267.85	1.35%	$169,045.32	1.84%	9.89%
SAN JON	$30,050.00	2.68%	$0.00	0.00%	$12,525.88	1.12%	6.41%
SANTA FE	$1,532,097.35	3.58%	$0.00	0.00%	$760,824.26	1.78%	8.03%
SANTA ROSA	$257,392.57	6.08%	$0.00	0.00%	$118,591.20	2.80%	11.49%
SILVER CITY	$289,565.86	1.92%	$251,294.27	1.66%	$263,029.24	1.74%	7.51%
SOCORRO	$370,974.20	4.59%	$142,770.98	1.77%	$243,822.16	3.02%	12.04%
SPRINGER	$110,857.26	5.64%	$0.00	0.00%	$34,049.23	1.73%	13.70%
TAOS	$659,733.83	5.02%	$543,641.60	4.14%	$356,043.70	2.71%	14.23%
TATUM	$66,574.12	3.33%	$0.00	0.00%	$44,466.95	2.23%	7.50%
TEXICO	$50,439.48	2.04%	$0.00	0.00%	$53,966.06	2.18%	5.88%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	$247,775.25	4.04%	$0.00	0.00%	$141,151.74	2.30%	8.74%
TUCUMCARI	$236,827.77	3.76%	$0.00	0.00%	$128,928.13	2.05%	8.69%
TULAROSA	$210,839.18	3.79%	$133,012.02	2.39%	$121,968.47	2.19%	17.05%
VAUGHN	$67,351.00	5.95%	$0.00	0.00%	$27,884.76	2.46%	12.91%
WAGON MOUND	$50,398.00	4.07%	$142,682.97	11.53%	$26,877.10	2.17%	20.32%
ZUNI	$713,342.34	7.95%	$157,998.32	1.76%	$328,261.03	3.66%	31.37%
STATEWIDE	$44,999,499.76	3.76%	$5,744,935.28	0.48%	$26,823,595.99	2.24%	10.17%

Note: Final expenditure figures upon which these calculations are based are subject to final verification by the SDE School Budget Planning Unit.

[1]USDA Free and Reduced Lunch Program expenditures do not include expenditures for free and reduced breakfasts.

[2]The expenditures included in the calculation of this percentage are those for all federal programs reported in the federal project series (17.000) in the districts' final expenditure reports and and for the USDA Free and Reduced Lunch Program; no federal funding for capital outlay is included.

Source: District Final Expenditure Reports, 1992-93.

TABLE 17

1992-93 PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT SERVED BY SELECTED PROGRAMS
1992-93 PERCENT OF ALL LUNCHES SERVED REPRESENTED BY FREE & REDUCED LUNCHES

DISTRICT	ESEA CHAPTER I (BASIC & MIGRANT)	ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL	STATE FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION A, B, C, & D	USDA FREE & REDUCED LUNCH/ PERCENT OF ALL MEALS SERVED
ALAMOGORDO	12.97%	0.00%	14.23%	67.05%
ALBUQUERQUE	14.18%	0.94%	19.23%	66.14%
ANIMAS	4.26%	0.00%	14.36%	46.66%
ARTESIA	9.93%	7.85%	12.24%	63.56%
AZTEC	18.70%	0.00%	17.32%	62.35%
BELEN	10.34%	6.32%	12.81%	77.29%
BERNALILLO	39.38%	6.98%	13.77%	80.10%
BLOOMFIELD	10.53%	0.00%	16.37%	70.20%
CAPITAN	53.26%	0.00%	13.95%	52.77%
CARLSBAD	13.20%	0.00%	15.98%	64.98%
CARRIZOZO	18.38%	0.00%	21.79%	63.05%
CENTRAL	30.34%	4.94%	12.86%	81.01%
CHAMA VALLEY	34.54%	0.00%	9.28%	78.13%
CIMARRON	11.55%	0.00%	15.28%	62.77%
CLAYTON	12.99%	0.00%	15.71%	66.29%
CLOUDCROFT	3.71%	0.00%	13.87%	45.62%
CLOVIS	15.18%	0.00%	11.90%	66.52%
COBRE	20.77%	8.16%	12.02%	73.66%
CORONA	22.73%	0.00%	14.77%	60.00%
CUBA	29.77%	0.00%	15.09%	87.71%
DEMING	21.34%	4.85%	9.72%	86.35%
DES MOINES	15.19%	0.00%	10.76%	36.75%
DEXTER	15.63%	15.53%	19.34%	72.28%
DORA	6.23%	0.00%	12.45%	52.91%
DULCE	11.28%	0.00%	13.10%	77.96%
ELIDA	8.33%	0.00%	22.22%	67.43%
ESPAÑOLA	16.37%	26.26%	12.69%	80.96%
ESTANCIA	17.40%	0.00%	14.57%	76.08%
EUNICE	3.79%	0.00%	10.78%	65.51%
FARMINGTON	6.97%	0.00%	13.76%	57.27%
FLOYD	53.74%	6.54%	24.77%	76.92%
FT. SUMNER	19.56%	0.00%	21.27%	59.19%
GADSDEN	35.08%	3.44%	10.16%	94.30%
GALLUP	32.68%	0.00%	13.67%	82.03%
GRADY	0.00%	0.00%	11.95%	36.73%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	32.22%	0.00%	9.23%	76.84%
HAGERMAN	48.41%	0.00%	15.68%	78.16%
HATCH	60.55%	0.00%	7.43%	86.06%
HOBBS	5.18%	0.00%	9.39%	62.90%
HONDO VALLEY	65.85%	0.00%	15.24%	79.69%
HOUSE	60.71%	0.00%	19.05%	55.81%
JAL	6.91%	0.00%	7.43%	57.43%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	96.63%	53.89%	10.74%	82.84%
JEMEZ VALLEY	7.29%	0.00%	20.23%	56.23%
LAKE ARTHUR	16.99%	0.00%	8.74%	80.05%
LAS CRUCES	13.18%	1.97%	16.91%	73.24%
LAS VEGAS CITY	14.76%	0.00%	14.09%	73.56%
LAS VEGAS WEST	25.81%	21.30%	9.48%	88.50%
LOGAN	14.80%	0.00%	16.12%	52.90%
LORDSBURG	23.03%	0.00%	14.18%	65.88%
LOS ALAMOS	3.71%	0.00%	23.91%	4.35%
LOS LUNAS	5.96%	10.22%	12.34%	66.70%
LOVING	44.51%	0.00%	14.07%	77.82%
LOVINGTON	24.91%	0.00%	13.25%	70.58%

TABLE 17, CONTINUED

DISTRICT	ESEA CHAPTER I (BASIC & MIGRANT)	ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL	STATE FUNDED SPECIAL EDUCATION A, B, C, & D	USDA FREE & REDUCED LUNCH/ PERCENT OF ALL MEALS SERVED
MAGDALENA	73.03%	21.07%	16.29%	83.15%
MAXWELL	9.45%	0.00%	17.32%	62.62%
MELROSE	12.23%	0.00%	24.82%	53.05%
MESA VISTA	62.55%	89.14%	15.92%	75.21%
MORA	20.78%	0.00%	7.48%	90.24%
MORIARTY	5.65%	0.00%	17.36%	55.93%
MOSQUERO	39.22%	0.00%	15.69%	42.44%
MOUNTAINAIR	52.61%	0.00%	21.09%	86.09%
PECOS	0.00%	0.00%	12.78%	71.08%
PEÑASCO	59.04%	50.57%	10.62%	81.09%
POJOAQUE	6.65%	43.49%	13.82%	63.42%
PORTALES	25.34%	0.00%	12.09%	72.17%
QUEMADO	9.33%	0.00%	12.44%	65.65%
QUESTA	14.02%	40.05%	10.01%	87.16%
RATON	10.32%	0.00%	10.32%	71.31%
RESERVE	14.34%	0.00%	10.39%	56.55%
ROSWELL	30.05%	2.82%	14.86%	77.38%
ROY	10.71%	0.00%	12.50%	44.56%
RUIDOSO	3.65%	8.04%	13.61%	68.04%
SAN JON	13.59%	0.00%	23.30%	46.56%
SANTA FE	22.82%	2.53%	14.01%	66.56%
SANTA ROSA	79.62%	0.00%	9.24%	90.19%
SILVER CITY	7.69%	4.60%	17.92%	69.34%
SOCORRO	22.72%	6.77%	12.87%	80.25%
SPRINGER	22.26%	0.00%	15.48%	72.49%
TAOS	20.91%	24.11%	12.15%	31.97%
TATUM	21.05%	0.00%	18.56%	64.83%
TEXICO	15.50%	0.00%	15.88%	61.61%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	14.78%	0.00%	13.38%	80.82%
TUCUMCARI	10.72%	0.00%	16.86%	63.82%
TULAROSA	15.51%	22.63%	19.25%	79.18%
VAUGHN	96.55%	96.55%	13.79%	86.59%
WAGON MOUND	22.60%	100.00%	12.99%	76.44%
ZUNI	35.45%	13.61%	13.43%	90.95%
STATEWIDE	18.00%	3.47%	15.38%	72.04%

Sources: District Final Expenditure Reports, 1992-93; SDE Special Projects internal report.

TABLE 18
1992-93 SPECIAL EDUCATION REVENUE ALLOTTED THROUGH THE STATE FUNDING FORMULA

DISTRICT	SPEC. ED. FUNDED UNITS[1]	SPEC. ED. FUNDING	PERCENT SPEC. ED.[2]
ALAMOGORDO	1,944.300	$3,631,874.63	15.08%
ALBUQUERQUE	37,096.900	$69,295,525.32	21.47%
ANIMAS	143.100	$267,305.08	11.57%
ARTESIA	690.900	$1,290,573.56	10.30%
AZTEC	890.100	$1,662,671.20	17.06%
BELEN	1,434.400	$2,679,401.82	18.74%
BERNALILLO	910.300	$1,700,403.99	14.23%
BLOOMFIELD	1,024.200	$1,913,164.63	16.08%
CAPITAN	134.700	$251,614.21	11.09%
CARLSBAD	1,499.900	$2,801,753.20	12.35%
CARRIZOZO	88.800	$165,874.85	12.93%
CENTRAL	1,543.500	$2,883,196.26	12.40%
CHAMA VALLEY	108.800	$203,234.05	6.95%
CIMARRON	190.000	$354,912.40	13.57%
CLAYTON	280.100	$523,215.60	12.57%
CLOUDCROFT	106.600	$199,124.54	8.69%
CLOVIS	1,738.700	$3,247,822.05	12.07%
COBRE	458.500	$856,459.66	12.60%
CORONA	36.600	$68,367.34	9.86%
CUBA	266.500	$497,811.34	12.65%
DEMING	954.400	$1,782,781.02	11.57%
DES MOINES	51.700	$96,573.53	9.15%
DEXTER	356.600	$666,114.54	16.14%
DORA	74.100	$138,415.84	10.73%
DULCE	178.700	$333,804.45	13.19%
ELIDA	52.400	$97,881.10	10.73%
ESPAÑOLA	1,399.000	$2,613,276.04	13.54%
ESTANCIA	208.700	$389,843.25	12.93%
EUNICE	164.100	$306,532.24	10.81%
FARMINGTON	2,417.800	$4,516,353.69	15.21%
FLOYD	96.200	$179,697.75	17.77%
FT. SUMNER	161.800	$302,235.93	15.42%
GADSDEN	2,131.900	$3,982,303.92	12.07%
GALLUP	3,234.000	$6,040,982.64	13.87%
GRADY	31.900	$59,587.92	6.64%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	918.400	$1,715,534.46	13.29%
HAGERMAN	111.400	$208,090.74	11.85%
HATCH	213.200	$398,249.07	8.20%
HOBBS	1,296.000	$2,420,876.16	9.47%
HONDO VALLEY	24.900	$46,512.20	5.11%
HOUSE	39.800	$74,344.81	11.51%
JAL	55.600	$103,858.58	4.78%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	107.200	$200,245.31	8.08%
JEMEZ VALLEY	703.300	$1,313,736.27	N.A.
LAKE ARTHUR	38.200	$71,356.07	7.79%
LAS CRUCES	6,151.800	$11,491,316.33	17.11%
LAS VEGAS CITY	678.800	$1,267,971.25	12.79%
LAS VEGAS WEST	484.800	$905,587.01	11.28%
LOGAN	91.600	$171,105.14	10.40%
LORDSBURG	254.100	$474,648.64	13.38%
LOS ALAMOS	1,253.700	$2,341,861.45	11.61%
LOS LUNAS	1,820.400	$3,400,434.38	16.17%
LOVING	134.500	$251,240.62	12.12%
LOVINGTON	737.100	$1,376,873.32	13.86%
MAGDALENA	136.500	$254,976.54	14.81%
MAXWELL	48.300	$90,222.47	11.93%
MELROSE	105.000	$196,135.80	13.54%
MESA VISTA	186.900	$349,121.72	12.27%
MORA	90.800	$169,610.77	5.32%
MORIARTY	1,254.200	$2,342,795.43	20.11%
MOSQUERO	30.000	$56,038.80	9.52%
MOUNTAINAIR	203.900	$380,877.04	19.34%
PECOS	262.400	$490,152.70	15.16%
PEÑASCO	134.800	$251,801.01	7.98%
POJOAQUE	406.400	$759,138.94	11.50%
PORTALES	554.800	$1,036,344.21	11.01%
QUEMADO	41.700	$77,893.93	6.51%
QUESTA	154.500	$288,599.82	9.05%
RATON	355.700	$664,433.37	11.57%
RESERVE	65.200	$121,790.99	7.88%
ROSWELL	2,833.000	$5,291,930.68	15.38%
ROY	31.100	$58,093.56	7.75%
RUIDOSO	618.000	$1,154,399.28	13.94%
SAN JON	60.800	$113,571.97	10.84%
SANTA FE	3,025.600	$5,651,699.78	14.36%
SANTA ROSA	189.600	$354,165.22	9.46%
SILVER CITY	1,304.200	$2,436,193.43	17.44%
SOCORRO	602.300	$1,125,072.31	15.84%
SPRINGER	107.300	$200,432.11	11.82%
TAOS	708.600	$1,323,636.46	11.74%
TATUM	119.300	$222,847.63	12.07%
TEXICO	163.600	$305,598.26	13.11%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	453.700	$847,493.45	15.16%
TUCUMCARI	501.800	$5,959.00	0.10%
TULAROSA	413.400	$772,214.66	16.75%
VAUGHN	60.800	$113,571.97	11.53%
WAGON MOUND	36.600	$68,367.34	6.93%
ZUNI	430.800	$804,717.17	13.07%
STATEWIDE	92,906.600	$172,614,429.21	16.07%

[1]Special education funded units are determined by multiplying the actual number of C-level and D-level special education students by the appropriate funding formula weighting factors and adding to that total the number of units calculated for A and B level programs and for ancillary services.

[2]The percent of the total operational budget represented by the special education revenue allotted through the formula and not by actual expenditures.

Source: District Final Expenditure Reports, 1992-93; Final Funded Membership Report, 1992-93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

National Education Association. *Rankings of the States, 1993.* Washington, DC: September 1993.

New Mexico State Board of Education. *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education: A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico.* NM State Department of Education. Santa Fe, NM: September 1992.

_____. *Educational Standards for New Mexico Schools.* NM State Department of Education. Santa Fe, NM: August 1990.

_____. "Standards for Excellence." NM State Department of Education memorandum. Santa Fe, NM: January 27, 1992.

New Mexico State Department of Education. *A First Look at New Mexico Public School Budgets 1991-92.* School Finance Division. Santa Fe, NM: [1991].

_____. *A First Look at New Mexico Public School Budgets 1992-93.* School Finance Division. Santa Fe, NM: [1992].

_____. *A First Look at New Mexico Public School Budgets 1993-94.* School Finance Division. Santa Fe, NM: [1993, In Press].

_____. *New Mexico ACT and SAT Results: 1991-92.* Assessment, Evaluation, and Information Services. Santa Fe, NM: July 1992.

_____. *New Mexico Statewide Articulated Assessment System.* Assessment and Evaluation Unit. 1993.

Oakes, Jeannie. *Educational Indicators: A Guide for Policymakers.* Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University, 1986.

Shavelson, Richard J., Lorraine M. McDonnell, and Jeannie Oakes, eds. *Indicators for Monitoring Mathematics and Science Education.* Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corp., 1989.

State of New Mexico. *Budget Analysis of State Agencies.* Legislative Finance Committee. Santa Fe, NM: 1993.

_____. "General Fund Financial Summary." Department of Finance Administration. Santa Fe, NM: August 25, 1993.

_____. *New Mexico Third Annual Progress Report on Education.* Office of the Governor. Santa Fe, NM: September 30, 1993.